



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

# STUDIES IN GREEK NOUN-FORMATION

Based in part upon material collected by the late A. W. Stratton<sup>1</sup>

## DENTAL TERMINATIONS III

### WORDS IN *-της*, *-τητος*

BY WALTER PETERSEN

The Greek suffix *-της*, *-τητος* (*-τᾶς*, *-τάτος*), used chiefly in the formation of adjectival abstracts, goes back to an Indo-European *-tāt-*, for it occurs in practically the same meaning in the Aryan languages (Skt. and Av. *-tāt-*) and the Italic<sup>2</sup> (Lat. *-tās*, gen. *-tātis*). The analogy of most suffixes whose history can be traced leads to the conclusion that this arose by extending the old abstract suffix *-tā-* by means of *-t-*, or *-ti-* in case of the parallel *-tātī-*, as is shown by Aufrecht *KZ.* 1. 159 ff., and accepted by Brugmann, *Gr.* 2. 1.<sup>2</sup> 450 f., and most other scholars, although Hirt, *Handb. der gr. Laut- und Formenl.*<sup>2</sup> 292 f., sees in it the remnant of an old IE word related to *\*tewā* ‘power,’ assuming that *-tāt-* and the synonymous *-tūt-* go back to the same original *\*twāt-*.

A number of Greek words in *-τητ-* have equivalent words in the same suffix in Sanskrit, Avestan, or Latin, either with complete correspondence of stem as well as ending, or with minor variations. In quoting these it is self-evident that there is no guaranty of IE origin, for each language may have formed a word independently, particularly Greek and Latin, in which the productivity of the suffix was large, and all the more so when such a word first appears in a late writer or in one who, like Aristotle, had a tendency to indulge in new formations of this type.

Brugmann, *op. cit.* 451, mentions the following four words as occurring in more than one language: *ὅλότης* ‘wholeness’ = Skt. *sarvātāt-* Av. *ha<sup>u</sup>rvatāt-* ‘wholeness, perfection’ : Skt. *sárva-s*, Gr. *ὅλος* < *ὅλφο-s*; *σκαιότης* ‘lefthandedness, awkwardness’ = Lat. *scaevitās* : Gr. *σκαιός*, Lat. *scaevas*; *νεότης* ‘youth’ = Lat. *novitās* : Gr.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Introductory Note, *C.P.* 5. 323 ff.

<sup>2</sup> There is only one example in the Oscan-Umbrian: Osc. *Herentateis* “Veneris” Pacl. *Herentas* “Venus.” Cf. Buck, *Gram. of Osc. and Umbr.* 185.

*νέος*, Lat. *novos*; Homeric δροτῆτα (usually ἀνδροτῆτα or ἀδροτῆτα, see p. 59) for \*δρα-τῆτα ‘manhood, strength,’ Av. *hu-nər<sup>2</sup>tāt-* ‘abstract ability’ : \*ner- Gr. ἀνήρ. To these might be added μακρότης ‘length’ = Lat. *macritās* ‘leanness’ : μακρός = *macer*. Only the Homeric νεότης and (ἀν)δροτῆτα are both themselves old words and correspond to old words of other languages.

Three other words common to Greek and Latin are certainly not Indo-European. Cicero himself confesses (*Tim.* 7. 20) with an apology that he coined *medietās*, which corresponds exactly to Gr. μεσότης ‘middle position’ : μέσος Lat. *medius*. Lat. *austēritās* is borrowed from Gr. αὐστηρότης ‘harshness’ : αὐστηρός, and *Christiānitās* is either borrowed from Gr. Χριστιανότης ‘Christianity,’ or formed from *Christiānus* which is itself borrowed from the Greek.

Probably, on the other hand, Gr. λειότης ‘smoothness’ and Lat. *lēvitās* have a common origin. This implies that the primitive of the latter was a prehistoric \**lēvos* = Gr. λεῖος instead of the extant *lēvis*, but transfers to the *i*-declension were common enough at all times.

Two pairs of Greek and Latin words differ only as to grade of the root vowel: ἄκρότης ‘extremity’ : ἄκρος *summus* and Lat. *ācritās* ‘sharpness, force’ : *ācer*<sup>1</sup> ‘sharp’; ὁρθότης ‘straightness, correctness’ : ὁρθός and Lat. *arduitās* ‘steepness’ : *arduuis* (cf. Meyer-Luebke, *ALL.* 8. 321). Common origin of course presupposes *original* complete identity of form, but the divergence may be due to later analogical changes which affected primitive and derivative in the same way.

A number of Greek and Latin words differ only by the addition of an *i* in the latter, e.g., ήδύτης ‘sweetness’ : ήδύς and *suāvitās* : *suāvis*. Here too original identity may have been disturbed by subsequent transfer to the *i*-declension in Latin, which transfer would naturally affect primitive and derivative alike unless they were no longer associated with each other. Similar are: βαρύτης and *gravitās* : βαρύς ‘heavy,’ βραχύτης and *brevitās* : βραχύς ‘short,’ γλυκύτης and *dulcitās* : γλυκύς ‘sweet.’

When there are more extensive differences between the suffixal parts of Greek words and those of related languages, we can merely

<sup>1</sup> Occurs as *o*-stem as well as *i*-stem. Cf. Charisius 63 and 93 P.

speak of the possibility of identical ultimate origin disturbed in the same way as in case of the *i*-stems. So ἀπλότης is related to Lat. *simplicitās*, δεξιότης to Skt. *dákṣatāti-* and Lat. *dexteritās*, ἐλαφρότης to Lat. *levitās*, ἐλευθεριότης to Lat. *libertās*,<sup>1</sup> πληρότης to Lat. *plēnitās*, ἀλυκότης to Lat. *salsitās*, θηριότης to Lat. *feritās*.<sup>2</sup>

From the small number of complete and convincing correspondences between Greek and other languages we may conclude that the productivity of the suffix was very slight in IE times, and this is further borne out by its rareness in Sanskrit and early Greek. As opposed to hundreds of these words in later Greek and in Latin, the Homeric poems have only nine: ἀ(ν)δροτής, δηιοτής, κακότης, νέότης, φιλότης, βραδυτής, ταχυτής, ίότης ποτής. In the Sanskrit, which alternated between the suffix forms *-tāt-* and *-tāti-* (the former only dat. instr. loc. sg.), there are only fourteen words ending in one or the other or both, of which two belong to the later language and all the rest are Vedic only.<sup>3</sup> Generally speaking, this slight development of an abstract suffix<sup>4</sup> is just what might be expected, for the luxuriant development of abstracts is a matter of literary prose, of science, philosophy, theology, literary criticism, etc.

1. *-τητ-* in derivatives from adjectives.—Since the suffix *-tāt-* was usually added to an adjective primitive, and since by far the largest group of adjectives from IE times was the *o*-stems with feminines in *-ā-* or *-ī-*, which would appear with *-o-* in derivation, it follows that in most words *-tāt-* was preceded by *o*, so that *-otāt-* was from the beginning the most common combination. Of the fourteen Sanskrit words in *-tāt(i)-* all except two have the corresponding *-a-tāt(i)-*, e.g. *uparātāt-* : *úpara-* ‘lower,’ *sarvātāt(i)-* : *sárvā-* ‘complete,’ *dákṣatāt(i)-* : *dákṣa-* ‘clever.’ Of the nine Homeric examples all except two end in *-ότης*, e.g., *κακότης* : *κακός* ‘bad,’ *νέότης* : *νέος* ‘young.’

<sup>1</sup> Lat. *libertās* < \*liberitās would correspond to Gr. \*ἐλευθερότης, and thus differs from ἐλευθερότης only by the absence of the suffixal *i*, as does Skt. *dákṣatāti-* from δεξιότης.

<sup>2</sup> Since θηριότης is derived from the substantive θηρίον, it is obvious that in this instance a common origin is impossible.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Whitney, *Skt. Gram.*<sup>3</sup> 476 f.

<sup>4</sup> However, Homer has 33 abstracts in *-συνη*, which evidently had a more poetic flavor than *-τητ-*. See pp. 74 f.

With the latter cf. Lat. *novitās* : *novos* ‘new.’ Similar Latin examples are *bonitās* : *bonus* ‘good,’ *dignitās* : *dignus* ‘worthy.’ From the Avestan might be mentioned: *uparatāt-*, identical with the Sanskrit word just mentioned, and *amər<sup>ə</sup>tatāt-* : *aməša-* ‘immortal.’

Of the 658 words in Gr. -της which I have found, all except twenty-eight end in -οτης, and of these 492, or about three-fourths of all words in -τητ-, are regular derivatives in -οτης from adjectives of the *o*-declension, or at least such adjectives are actually found, and, with rare exceptions, must have been the real primitives. No doubt in case of a few words some speakers associated them with the substantive use of the primitive rather than the adjectival (e.g., *φίλος* ‘friend’ instead of ‘friendly’), and in other instances such substantives might have been the real primitives, but these would easily be counterbalanced by others which seem to belong to an irregular type only because the real adjective primitive in *o* does not happen to be extant.

Only a few additional older examples of regular derivatives from *o*-adjectives can be mentioned. In Homer is found *φιλότης* : *φίλος*, *δημοτής* : *δῆμος*, in Pindar *ἀβρότης* : *ἀβρός*, in Aeschylus e.g., *λειότης* : *λεῖος*, in Herodotus *δεξιότης* : *δεξιός*, *καθαριότης* : *καθάριος*, *λαμπρότης* : *λαμπρός*, *οἰκείότης* : *οἰκείος*, *πικρότης* : *πικρός*, *πιστότης* : *πιστός*, *σκαιότης* : *σκαιός*, *στενότης* : *στενός*.

Next in importance to the adjectival *o*-stems were the *u*-stems, from which are derived the words in IE and Skt. -utāt-, Gr. -υτητ-. The only Sanskrit example is *vasútati-* ‘goodness, generosity’ : *vásu-* ‘good.’ Avestan has *po<sup>u</sup>rūtāt-* ‘multiplicity’ : *po<sup>u</sup>rū-* ‘much.’ Latin offers no examples because the old adjectival *u*-stems had become *o*- or *i*-stems. Cf. Stolz, *Hist. Gram.* 456.

In Greek are found twenty-seven words in -υτης, and of these twenty-three come from extant adjectives in *u*. Homer has the pair of opposites *βραδυτής* ‘slowness’ : *βραδύς* ‘slow’ and *ταχυτής* ‘swiftness’ : *ταχύς* ‘swift.’ By analogy to the latter was formed the Pindaric *ώκυτης* : *ώκυς* ‘swift.’ In Aeschylus first appears *τραχυτής* ‘roughness’ : *τραχύς*, in Herodotus *γλυκύτης* ‘sweetness’ : *γλυκύς* and *παχύτης* ‘thickness’ : *παχύς*. Similarly, from the Classical period, *ἀμβλύτης*, *βαρύτης*, *βραχύτης*, *δασύτης*, *δριμύτης*, *εὐθύτης*,

εὐρύτης, θηλύτης, θρασύτης, δέξιος, πλατύτης, and, from later writers, βαθύτης, ἥδυτης, ιθύτης, λιγύτης, πραύτης, πρεσβυτάς.<sup>1</sup>

Adjectival *i*-stems are not found in Greek except the numeral *τρεῖς τρία* and *τρόφις* ‘well-fattened, large,’ of which the latter was probably substantival in origin (cf. Brugmann-Thumb, *Gr. Gr.* 474). Consequently there is no combination *-ιτης* corresponding to the Latin *-itās* in *quālitās* ‘quality’ : *quālis*, *nōbilitās* : *nōbilis*, etc. Similarly the Aryan languages lack *-itāt-* except in the Avestan *kəvītāt-* from the substantive *kavi-*. However, Greek does have one derivative from an exocentric adjective whose last component is a substantive in *i*, sc. *ἀχαρότης* ‘stupidity’ (found in Polybius) : *ἄχαρις*,<sup>2</sup> with *-ιτης* instead of *\*-ιτης*.

This word is an example of what has happened in derivation with *-τητ-* to every primitive except *o-* and *v*-stems. While the expected *-υτης* held its own for the latter, all other words yielded to the immense preponderance of words in *-οτης*, and were somehow assimilated to them, either by the abstraction of *-οτης*<sup>3</sup> as a unified suffix and its addition to the stem of the primitive, or by modifying the primitive stem so that *-οτης* was the result. It is the same thing as e.g. *αιματ-ό-eis* ‘bloody’ : *αιμα αἰματ-ος*, *σκι-ό-eis* ‘shady’ : *σκιά*.

The simplest case is that of the *ντ*-stems, for which the unendurable combination *-ντ-της* and consequent obscuring phonetic changes were avoided by the *o*-extension. The earliest example is cited from Chrysippus by Plutarch : *χαριεντότης* ‘gracefulness of manner’ : *χαρίεις*, *-εντος*. Also two from the Roman and Byzantine periods: *ὄντότης* ‘the beingness’ : *ών*, *ὄντος*, *παντότης* ‘universality’ : *πᾶς*, *παντός*. Cf. Lat. *voluntās* < \**volunitās* : *voluns*, *-untis*. On the other hand, the Avestan added *-tāt-* directly to the *nt*-stem, e.g., in *uxšyqstāt-* ‘condition of increase’ : *uxšyant-* ‘increasing.’

<sup>1</sup> The primitive *πρέσβυς* is used substantivally as well as adjectivally, but since *-υ-της* does not occur elsewhere in derivatives from substantives, it is probably to be referred to the adjectival use.

<sup>2</sup> Although *χάρις* and its compound *ἄχαρις* are inflected as *τ*-stems, the original is shown by derivatives like *χαρεῖς*.

<sup>3</sup> In this process congeneric assimilation no doubt played a part. Cf. Debrunner *Gr. Wortbild*, 184, who suggests *μελανότης* : *μέλαν* after *λευκότης* : *λευκός*, *παντότης* : *παντ-* after *ὅλότης* : *ὅλος*.

The only other derivative from an adjective in an explosive is ἀφηλικότης ‘childhood, nonage’ from the *κ*-stem ἀφῆλιξ ‘young.’ For its formation, exactly like χαριεντότης, cf. Lat. *capacitās* : *capax*, -*acis*. It is as late as the sixth century A.D.

Adjectival *n*-stems of the Greek are all secondary and have no counterpart in other languages<sup>1</sup> except the comparatives, which are also found in the Germanic. Since this language group does not know the suffix *-tāt-*, Greek words in *-τητ-* from *v*-stems are without analogy in other languages. In the Classical period are found only three derivatives from non-comparatives, all from Aristotle: ἀρρενότης ‘manhood’ : ἄρρην ‘male,’ μελανότης ‘blackness’ : μέλας, -*avos* ‘black,’ ἐνότης ‘unity’ : εἷς, ἐνός<sup>2</sup> ‘one.’ After the last was patterned its Byzantine compound οὐθενότης ‘nothingness’ : οὐθεῖς. These words agree in adding *-οτης* to the unchanged stem like χαριεντότης, unless μελανότης goes back to a parallel *o*-adjective related to Skt. *maliná-s* ‘dirty,’ which would then also be found in compounds like μελανό-πτερος. Cf. Brugmann, *IF*. 9. 366 ff.

After the Classical period development took place in two directions. On the one hand the type ἀρρενότης was extended to comparatives: ἔλαττονότης ‘a being less’ : ἔλάττων, μειζονότης ‘greater magnitude’ : μείζων, πλειονότης ‘length of syllable’ : πλείων. On the other hand there is found a new type in which the suffix *-ον-* disappears before *-οτης*, for the first time in *τεραμότης* (Theophrastus) ‘softness,’ derived from the non-comparative *τεράμων*, *-ovos*. Then also similar derivatives from comparatives: ἀρεότης ‘excellence’ : ἀρείων ‘better,’ μειότης ‘lesser part of a number’ : μείων ‘less,’ πλειότης ‘plurality’ : πλείων. Possibly also βελτιότης : βελτίων (Schol. Pind. *O*. 1. 5), although the reading is doubtful. All these were no doubt patterned after compounds<sup>3</sup> in which *o* appeared for *ον* of the first member, as μειό-φρων, ἀκμό-θετον (*ἄκμων*), 'Απολλόδωρος ('Απόλλων), which were an IE inheritance. Cf. Brugmann, *Gr*. 2. 1.<sup>2</sup> 84 f.

<sup>1</sup> Adjectival exocentric compounds with *v*-substantives as final member could of course occur anywhere.

<sup>2</sup> I classify here because there is no trace of the original *m*-stem in the whole paradigm.

<sup>3</sup> Perhaps the immediate patterns were rather the numerous words in *-οσήνη* which are derived from *v*-stems, e.g., σωφροσήνη:σώφρων, but these in turn must have been influenced by the still older compounds.

Adjectival -εσ- stems of the Greek show no trace of the formation of Lat. *vetus-tās*<sup>1</sup> : *vetus* ‘old,’ in which -tāt- is added to the unchanged stem, but end in -οτης. In two words this is evidently added to the stem of the primitive, with the result -εότης after dropping the inter-vocalic σ. This would remain uncontracted in writers under Ionic influence, so that we find ἀτρεμέότης<sup>2</sup> ‘security, firmness’ (:ἀτρεμῆς) in Hippocrates, and in Galen ἀλεότης ‘an assemblage’ : ἀλής.

Everywhere else the -εσ- disappears before -οτης just like the -ον- in τεραμότης. From Alexandrian times we find in Callistratus εύμαρότης ‘ease’ : εύμαρής. From the Roman and Byzantine periods:<sup>3</sup> ἀληθότης : ἀληθής, ἀπηνότης : ἀπηνής, ἀσινότης : ἀσινής, ἀτρεκότης : ἀτρεκής, ἀφελότης : ἀφελής, ἐναργότης : ἐναργής, ἐπιμερότης : ἐπιμερής, θεοπρεπότης : θεοπρεπής, πληρότης : πληρής, ὑπερπληρότης : ὑπερπληρής, ὑγιότης : ὑγιής. In the Thesaurus is also found διηνεκότης : διηνεκής. No doubt a plurality of factors contributed to the prevalence of this type. If, e.g., \*πληρεότης would have existed in Attic, its contraction to \*πληρούτης would have isolated it and caused assimilation to the regular type, so that πληρότης would have resulted after all. Moreover, the darkening of the structure of the oblique cases of the -εσ- stems by contraction (cf. e.g., εὐγενοῦς < \*εὐγενέσ-ος) led to using the root as the basis of derivation quite generally, for case-ending and stem-suffix had coalesced into one syllable which probably was felt as a case-ending. Thus εύμαρότης from εύμαρής is not at all different from γενικός : τὸ γένος, τειχίον : τὸ τεῖχος, or σκελισκον : τὸ σκέλος. Cf. the writer’s *The Gr. Dimin. Suf.* -ισκο- 148. Finally, there is the possibility that cases in which the real primitive was an o-adjective, existing alongside of an -εσ- adjective to which the derivative could be referred, acted as patterns. Thus ὁμαλότης ‘evenness’ (Plato and Aristotle) could be referred either to ὁμαλός, -ή, -όν, or to ὁμαλής, -ές, and, later, τρανότης either to τρανός or τρανής, ὑδαρότης either to ὑδαρός or ὑδαρής.

In addition to these categories of transparent regular derivatives in -τητ- from adjectives there are a number of others which show

<sup>1</sup> That *vetus* “old” was originally a substantive does not concern us here, where it is a question of form only.

<sup>2</sup> Also spelled ἀτρεμαότης, and must then be referred to ἀτρεμαῖς.

<sup>3</sup> In earlier times -εια <-εσ-ια was used when abstracts from σ-stems were wanted. Cf. ἀλήθεια : ἀληθής, similarly ἀπήνεια, ἀτρέκεια, ἀφέλεια, εύμαρεια, ὑγίεια.

real or apparent irregularities. Thus ἀπλότης ‘singleness,’ first occurring in Xenophon, seems to be derived from ἀπλός, ἀπλοῦς, but is really a regular derivative from the parallel ἀπλός, -ή, -όν, found, e.g., in the Cretan ἀπλεῖ, and identical with Lat. *simplus*.<sup>1</sup> Similarly the Byzantine διπλότης is to be referred to διπλός instead of διπλός. As to πολλότης (Damasc.), it is of course based on the stem πολλο- (e.g. in gen. sg., πολλοῦ) rather than on πολυ-, as μεγαλότης on μεγάλου, etc., instead of μέγας. The late Byzantine γρηγορότης ‘watchfulness,’ apparently a verbal derivative from γρηγορέω, is derived from an adjective γρήγορος, found, e.g., in the Christian inscription *CIG.* 8686 τὸ γρήγορον φῶς.

The Homeric ιότης ‘will, desire’ is to be derived from a prehistoric adjective \*ίσος, \*ios identical with Skt. *iṣa-*s ‘seeking, desiring,’ and thus belongs to the most common type. Cf. Pott, *Et. Forsch.* 1. 269, Curtius, *Gr. Et.*<sup>5</sup> 402, Angermann, *Curt. Stud.* 3. 122, Boisacq, s.v. Fick 1.<sup>4</sup> 543 would assume \*φιότης as the original form and thus relate to θεμαι, but there is no evidence of a φ in any dialect. Herwerden’s assumption of a φιότατι (*Lex. suppl.*) in Aleman is a double error: the fragment is from Alceaeus, and the MS reading is ιοτητι. Cf. Sommer, *Gr. Lautst.* 13.

As to βιότης ‘livelihood’ (h. Hom. 8. 10), which is usually considered a derivative from the substantive βίος ‘life,’ I believe with Aufrecht, *KZ.* 1. 160, that it is to be referred to the prehistoric adjectival use of βίος as found in Goth. *quius* ‘alive’ and Eng. *quick*, and, with long ī, in Skt. *jīva-*s Lat. *vīvus*, etc., so that this also would belong to the most frequent class of words in -τητ-. If it is derived from the substantive, the suffix, as Aufrecht says, would be otiose. While this would not in itself be a valid objection, it will be seen below that as such a derivative it would not have a pattern to follow at such an early date. Possibly, however, it might be a singular instance of congeneric assimilation to another word in -τητ- derived from an adjective, for in the passage cited κακότης ‘wretchedness, poverty’ is opposed to the plentiful livelihood suggested by βιότης itself. In this case, then, the author of the hymn formed the word himself, and it was due to remodelling an existing βίος, βιοτή, or βιότος of virtually identical meaning.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Walde, *Lat. Etym. Wörterb.*, s.v.

Herodian π. μον. λεξ. 40. 5 mentions as a doubtful word δανοτής, quoting a fragment of Sophocles: ἐν ᾧ παύσεσθ' ἀμερίων μόχθων καὶ δανοτῆτος. He then states it might be sound if it should prove to be a nominal derivative. Modern opinions vary widely. Wackernagel, *Gött. Nachr.* 1909. 58, thinks δαιοτῆτος should be read because of the circumflex on the penult, but the fact that the two words were synonymous and that the accent of the one influenced the other is no argument for assuming that one was spurious. Liddell and Scott would refer to the Macedonian δάνος ‘death,’ so that it would mean ‘mortality, misery.’ However, we certainly cannot accuse Sophocles of pedantically forming a word of this kind from a foreign word not actually in use. The solution seems to me to lie in assuming that the root-vowel was long ā,<sup>1</sup> and that the primitive was the adjective δᾶνός ‘burnt, dry,’ thought of, however, in the active sense ‘burning, consuming,’ a transfer of meaning frequent enough in the tragedians. Cf. e.g. ὑποπτεῖος<sup>2</sup> ‘suspecting’ in Eur. *Hec.* 1135, not ‘suspected.’ Thus the primitive of δανοτής would be synonymous with that of δηιοτής, and the derivatives would naturally be synonymous and associated with each other, the former no doubt being patterned after the latter. It is this which accounts for the common accent and the common idea of the burning, consuming struggle rather than the spuriousness of the rarer and later form.

As far as can be made out from the corrupt text, Herodian designates as spurious ὄρσότης, used by Critias<sup>3</sup> for ὄρμή. This meaning suggests a relation to the verb ὄρνυμ, which cannot be that of direct derivation, for a derivation from the future ὄρσω or aorist ὄρσα would be highly improbable. While it may be a false form, yet it is more probable that it is derived from an adjective which Herodian did not know, sc. a lost \*ὄρσός ‘rising, impetuous,’ whose formation would be exactly like φριξός ‘bristling’ or γαμψός ‘curved,’ whence ὄρσότης ‘impetuosity’ would be regularly derived.

<sup>1</sup> Such is also presupposed by the derivation quoted by Lentz *ad Herodian, loc. cit.*, from Lehrs, that the primitive was the adverb δᾶν, a theory otherwise to be rejected because of semantic difficulties as well as the absence of other derivatives from adverbs until the Roman period.

<sup>2</sup> That the verbals in -τος were originally indifferent as to voice does not prevent such variations from appearing and really being changes in the individual word, and thus serving as models for others.

<sup>3</sup> The MS reading is Κρατίᾳ, but the change to Κριτίᾳ is practically certain.

Some irregularities are caused by association with other related words in addition to the adjective primitives. Thus in six late derivatives from adjectives there exists an apparent conglutinate *-ιοτης*:<sup>1</sup> ἐτερόχροιότης : ἐτερόχροος ‘of different color,’ ἡλικιότης : ἥλιξ ‘of the same age,’ ἀφηλικιότης : ἀφῆλιξ ‘young,’ ἔγκαιριότης : ἔγκαιρος ‘seasonable,’ ὡχριότης : ὡχρός ‘pale,’ γειτνιότης ‘neighborhood’ : γείτων ‘neighboring.’ The first is to be explained by the association of the synonym ἐτερόχροια ‘difference of color,’ unless the real primitive was \*ἐτερόχροος, accidentally not quotable. The second and third were similarly influenced by their synonyms ἡλικία and ἀφηλικία, as was ἔγκαιριότης by ἔγκαιρία and ὡχριότης by ὡχρία. For γειτνιότης the influence of γειτνία is particularly plain because of the weak grade of the primitive stem-suffix (*γειτν-* instead of *γείτον-*), otherwise unknown for words in *-τητ-*. These six words in *-ιοτης* suggest that ἀνελευθέριος, which does not occur before Chrysostomus, may not be the real primitive of the Aristotelian ἀνελευθεριότης, but that the latter is formed from the common ἀνελεύθερος under the influence of its synonym ἀνελευθερία and the simple ἐλευθέριος and ἐλευθεριότης. It is also possible that words in *-ιοτης* were at least partially patterned after, e.g., ἐλευθεριότης, which, though derived from ἐλευθέριος, might have been referred to ἐλεύθερος.

More complex associations seem to have caused the following irregularities. Instead of the earlier *μακρότης* ‘length’ : *μακρός* ‘long,’ *μηκότης* is found in Galen. In this case the superlative *μήκιστος* as well as the synonym *τὸ μῆκος* were the disturbing elements. In the same way *ληθότης* ‘forgetfulness,’ if derived from the adjective *ληθαῖος* ‘forgetful,’ lost its *ai* under the influence of its synonym *λήθη* or the verb *λήθω*. However, both of these words may rather be due to substitution of suffixes, for which cf. page 60.

When *-οτης* was preceded by a *τ*, the existence of two syllables with the same consonant might lead to simplification by haplology. This would be particularly prone to happen in the oblique cases, in which three successive syllables began with *τ* followed by a vowel, and most of all in the genitive singular, in which the combination *το* was repeated in the first and third place, as it would, e.g., in *ἀκρατότητος*. This has been widely assumed to have been the cause of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. ἀγγελιότης from the substantive ἀγγέλος, p. 60.

the irregular *ποτής* and *πινυτᾶς*, e.g., by Ebel, *KZ*. 1. 303, and Brugmann, *Gr.* 2. 1. 2452, and it is really the only probable explanation offered, for the other suggestion of Brugmann (*loc. cit.*) that they were primary formations (cf. *ποτής* and the verb-forms *πέπομαι* and *ἐπόθην*, *πινυτᾶς* and *πινύσκω*) meets with the difficulty that there were no patterns to follow. Derivation with *-tāt-* from verbs was unknown everywhere in the IE languages except in a few late Greek and Latin examples, while *ποτής* was principally Homeric, and at all events so old that the suffix at the time of its formation had displayed small productivity, so that no model for congeneric assimilation could possibly be found. As far, then, as *ποτής* is concerned, it was derived from the verbal adjective *ποτός* 'drinkable,' and was originally *\*ποτο-τητ-* 'drinkability,' and was secondarily applied to that which was drinkable, the drink itself. This derivation receives further support from the fact that of the ten Homeric occurrences nine<sup>1</sup> are found in the genitive singular, where, as we have seen, haplogy would take place most easily, and one in the accusative (σ 407), while the nominative singular, where conditions were least favorable, does not occur anywhere. Evidently, then, haplogy was so frequent in that case that the short form became the regular form, and was followed more hesitatingly by the other oblique cases, while the nominative remained *\*ποτότης*, but became isolated from the other cases and was lost altogether, so that the *ποτής* of the dictionaries is a form which never existed except as a sporadic irregularity. The genitive, on the other hand, maintained itself because imbedded in stereotyped phrases like *ἔδητίος* ήδὲ *ποτῆτος* (δ 788). In favor of a similar origin of *πινυτᾶς* 'wisdom' is the fact that its only occurrence (*Anth. P.* 7. 490) is also a genitive (*πινυτᾶτος* for *\*πινυτότατος*). We may, however, allow the possibility that its association with the related synonym *πινυτή* may have caused the loss of the *το*, in which case its occurrence in the genitive would be accidental.

Haplogy I also conceive to be the cause for the genitive *ἀκαθάρτητος* for *\*ἀκαθαρτότητος* 'uncleanliness': *ἀκάθαρτος*, which, although not found in the MSS, was at one time adopted by Tischendorf in *Apoc.* 17. 4. While this is probably not the correct reading, and

<sup>1</sup> These are: Α 780, Τ 306, δ 788, ε 201, ι 87, κ 58, 379, 384, ρ 603.

the fact that it is the only word in which *-τητ-* is not preceded by *ο* or *υ* shows it to be merely an occasional formation, it may nevertheless be a genuine form which slipped in from some source unknown to us, and its occurrence in the genitive is a point in its favor.

Even in those words which have only one *τ* in the nominative singular the oblique cases would show the succession of syllables which might lead to haplology, and in one instance that seems to have led to a form actually preserved in writing. I am referring to the Cretan accusative *νεότα* < *νεότατα*, found in the inscription *SGDI. 5011. 9* (cf. Bechtel, *BB. 25. 162*, Buck, *Gr. Dial. 70*). That this accusative actually comes from *νεότας* is shown by the occurrence of the latter in the next inscription (5012. 6) in the same sense ‘body of young men.’ In the same line as *νεότα* is found also *νεότας* as genitive singular, but to assume that this too is caused by haplology violates the rule that the quality of the second vowel displaces that of the first in all such changes when their qualities differ. Cf. Brugmann-Thumb 160. Possibly some abstract in *-τᾶ* comparable in form to *βιοτή* was associated closely enough to cause the adoption of its genitive form in *-τᾶς*.

It is evident that any adjectival abstract in *-της* could suffer composition, as could any other substantive, and it therefore requires no comment when we find, e.g., in Plotinus *αὐτο-ετερότης* without intervening adjective *\*αὐτοέτερος*. Similarly *αὐθ-αγιότης*,<sup>1</sup> *αὐθ-ωραιότης*, *αὐτ-ισότης*,<sup>1</sup> *αύτο-λογιότης*, *αύτο-μακαριότης*, *αύτο-ξηρότης*, *αύτο-ολότης*, *αύτο-ομοιότης*, *αύτο-ποσότης*, *αύτο-πράτης*, *αύτο-σεμιότης*, *αύτο-σμικρότης*. With privative *ἀ(ν)-* : *ἀ-ματαιότης*, *ἀν-εικαιότης*, *ἀν-ευθύτης*. Also the miscellaneous compounds *ἐθελο-ακρότης*, *μυριο-μακαριότης*, *όρνιθο-τυφλότης*, *πολυθεο-αθέοτης*, *πολυκυριότης*, *ξυμ-μεσότης*. All of these words are from late philosophers and theologians, beginning with the second century A.D.

Adding the number of words of the different types so far discussed, which include all those which, directly or indirectly, go back to adjective primitives, the result is that 586, or 89 per cent of all words in *-της*, are derived from adjectives. This coincides rather closely

<sup>1</sup> Alongside of *αὐθαγιότης* is found *αὐτοαγιότης* with existing primitive *αὐτοάγιος*. It is just as probable that *αὐθαγιότης* was not made directly from its components, but remodeled from the latter by subsequent application of the principle of elision. Similarly *αὐτισότης* alongside of *αύτοισότης* from *αὐτοίσος*.

with the statistics of Paucker, *KZ.* 23. 157, for the Latin, who found that over 93 per cent of the Latin words in *-tās*, *-tātis* came from indisputable adjectives.

2. *-τητ-* in derivatives from substantives.—Most of the remaining Greek words and almost all of the remaining Latin words in *-tāt-* have substantive primitives, e.g. ἀνεψιός ‘relationship of cousin’ : ἀνεψιός ‘cousin,’ θεότης ‘divinity’ : θέος, Lat. *civitās* ‘citizenship’ : *civis* ‘citizen,’ *virginitās* ‘maidenhood’ : *virgo*. The Sanskrit similarly has *āstatāti-* : *āsta-m* ‘home,’ *çámitāti-* : *çám-* ‘good fortune, blessing,’ the Avestan, e.g., *daēvōtāt-* : *daēva-* ‘false god, démon.’ One word, *sc. ἀ(ν)δροτής* ‘manhood, strength’ (cf. Av. *hu-nar<sup>9</sup>tāt-* and see p. 59), Greek seems to have inherited from the parent language. That this, however, was only an occasional formation, and that *-tāt-* could not have been productive in forming derivatives from substantives, is shown by the absence of the combination *-ā-tāt-* in all languages. The extremely large class of substantives in *ā* would certainly have left such a combination somewhere, just as the *o*-, *u*-, and *i*-stems gave *-o-tāt-*, *u-tāt-*, *-i-tāt-*. Evidently derivation of words from substantives became more common only after the combinations with the common adjectival suffixes had become fixed, and when the need of such derivatives from substantives in *ā* was felt, they were made to end in *-otης*, e.g., *τραπεζότης* : *τράπεζα*, *ὑλότης* : *ὑλη*, for *ā*-adjectives were only the feminines of masculine neuter *o*, and would not have been known as basis of derivation.

In Greek this inherited (*ἀν*)*δροτής* became isolated early and used only in stereotyped combinations. Even its phonetic peculiarities (p. 59) would prevent its serving as a model for others, and so it remained alone for centuries, unless *βιότης* (p. 51) was derived from the substantive *βίος*, or, what is more probable, became associated with it after the loss of its real adjective primitive. However, even so, since its suffix conveyed no meaning, it could not serve as a model for a living category. Consequently this word also did not lead to imitation, and it was not before the end of the fifth century B.C. that the next word in *-τητ-* derived from a substantive appeared.

This is ἀνεψιότης ‘cousinship’ : ἀνεψιός, first found in an Attic inscription of the year 408–409<sup>1</sup> (*IG.* 1. 61. 15). Next come two

<sup>1</sup> The word is found in a quoted Draconian law, so that it is really much older than the date of the inscription if the law has been quoted verbatim.

words in Plato : *κναθότης* ‘abstract nature of a cup’ : *κνάθος*, and *τραπεζότης* ‘abstract quality of a table’ : *τράπεξα*. These are clearly the result of conscious philosophical abstraction, as are also the Aristotelian *ποδότης* ‘the quality of having feet’ : *πούς*, and *πτερότης* ‘abstract quality of πτερά.’ Also in Aristotle, but with a more natural appearance, are found *θηριότης* ‘bestiality’ : *θηρίον* ‘beast’ and *λιπότης* ‘fatness’ : *τὸ λίπος* ‘fat.’ All other instances are post-Classical. Two or three first appear in the Septuagint, and about 45 in the Roman and Byzantine periods. All of this shows that this type of derivative was a gradual growth, and that even after a few patterns existed other words followed at first only hesitatingly and to some extent self-consciously.

In view of the absence of a hard-and-fast dividing line between substantive and adjective and the frequency with which adjectives become substantives, it is not surprising that derivatives in *-τητ-* should spread from the former to the latter. Thus *κακότης* could be thought of in connection with *ὁ κακός* ‘coward’ as ‘the nature of a coward’ as well as with *κακός* ‘cowardly,’ and *φιλότης* ‘love, friendship’ might as well be ‘the quality of a friend’ as ‘friendliness.’ Or *μεσότης medietas* might as well be referred to the neuter *τὸ μέσον* ‘the middle’ as to the adjective *μέσος*. No doubt *ἀνεψιότης* ‘cousinship’ was patterned in this way directly after *φιλότης* ‘friendship.’

Contributing factors were the influence of congeneric words, as was shown for *ἀνεψιότης*, and the fact that derivatives from exocentric adjective compounds could serve as patterns for forming similar derivatives from the substantive final members. This is evidently the cause when the adjective primitive is a compound with privative *ἀ-* and therefore the opposite of the final substantive. After *ἀ-σωματότης* ‘incorporeality’ : *ἀ-σώματος* was patterned *σωματότης* ‘corporeality’ : *σῶμα* ‘body,’ after *ἄιλότης* ‘immateriality’ : *ἄ-νλος* ‘immaterial’ *ἴλιότης* ‘materiality’ : *ἴλη* ‘material.’ Probably also *ψυχότης* : *ψυχή* after *ἄψυχότης* : *ἄψυχος*. A contributing factor the compound may have been for *οὐσιότης* : *οὐσία* (cf. *ἔτερο-ουσιότης* : *ἔτερο-ούσιος*).

All of such derivatives from substantives end in *-οτης*, while *-υτης*<sup>1</sup> is not found. Most of them are regular derivatives from *o*-stems. Above have been mentioned *ἀνεψιότης*, *κναθότης*, *θηριότης*, *πτερότης*.

<sup>1</sup> For *πρεσβύτης* see p. 48.

In the Septuagint are found ἀδελφότης ‘brotherly affection’ : ἀδελφός ‘brother,’ λοιμότης : λοιμός, and the doubtful κρημνότης : κρημνός. The others are Roman and Byzantine words: ἄγγελότης (ἄγγελος), ἀγρότης<sup>2</sup> (ἀγρός), ἀνθρωπότης (ἀνθρωπος), ἀπελευθερότης (ἀπελεύθερος), αὐτοθεότης (αὐτόθεος), αὐχμότης (αὐχμός), βαρβαρότης (βάρβαρος),<sup>1</sup> βορβορότης (βόρβορος), γριφότης (γρῖφος), δενδρότης (δένδρον), διαβολότης (διάβολος),<sup>1</sup> ἐπαρχότης (ἐπαρχος), ἑταιρότης (ἑταιρος), ἐφηβότης (ἐφηβος), ζώρητης (ζώνων),<sup>1</sup> θεότης (θεός), ἵπποτης<sup>2</sup> (ἵππος), καθολικότης (καθολικός),<sup>1</sup> κορυφαιότης (κορυφαῖος), κυκλότης (κύκλος), μαγιστρότης (μάγιστρος), νούτης (νόος), παιδιότης (παιδίον), πατρικότης (πατρίκιος), πλινθότης (πλίνθος), Σεβαστότης (Σεβαστός),<sup>1</sup> συνανθρωπότης (συνάνθρωπος), νιότης (νιός), ὑπαρχότης (ὑπαρχος), Χριστιανότης (Χριστιανός), Χριστότης (Χριστός).<sup>1</sup>

Derivatives in -τητ- from substantives in -ᾱ- (-η, -ια) have -οτης for \*-ᾱτης \*-ητης. Aside from the Platonic τραπεζότης : τράπεζα, already mentioned, we find only post-Classical examples: καρδιότης : καρδία, λημότης : λήμη, νεανιότης : νεανία, ούσιότης : ούσια, ἔξουσιότης : ἔξουσία, ὑλότης : ὕλη, ψυχότης : ψυχή. Patterns for this substitution were similar substitutions before older suffixes and in compounds, e.g., σκιέις : σκιά, ὑλο-τόμος : ὕλη, Νικό-μαχος : νίκη, for the latter, in fact, an IE inheritance.<sup>3</sup> The appearance of ο for ḁ (necessary for the masc. neut.) of final members of exocentric adjectives contributed toward the same result. When ḁ-υλότης ‘immateriality,’ derived from the adjective ḁ-υλος, became the pattern for ὑλότης ‘materiality’: ὕλη, the result was the derivation of a word in -οτης from a substantive in -η. Still another factor may have been words like φιλότης in the meaning ‘love,’ which, though derived from the adjective φίλος, might occasionally have been associated with the substantivized feminine φίλη ‘friend’ in the same way as with the masculine (p. 57).

The only derivative from ι-stems is ὄφιότης ‘natura serpentis’ : ὄφις, cited from Athanasius. For its formation cf. ἀχαριότης from an exocentric adjective compound (p. 48).

<sup>1</sup> In these words adjectives which look like their primitives also exist, but the meaning of the derivative in every case points to the substantive: e.g., διαβολότης is not ‘slanderousness,’ but ‘devilishness.’

<sup>2</sup> To be carefully distinguished from ἀγρότης -ου ‘country-man’ and ἵπποτης -ου ‘horseman.’

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Brugmann, *op. cit.* 81 f.

Two late words in *-οτης* are derived from substantives in diphthongs. In the Byzantine ἀρχιερότης ‘high-priesthood’ : ἀρχιερές association with the adjective *ἱερός* ‘holy’ has led to the loss of the *εν*. In case of *γραύτης* ‘old-womanishness’ : *γραῦς*, found only in the *CGL.*, the treatment of the primitive stem evidently follows that in compounds like the Aristophanic *γρᾶο-σόβης* ‘scaring old women.’

Stems in explosives, like those from adjectives, add *-οτης* to the unchanged stem. From a root-noun in δ is found *ποδότης* (Aristotle) : *πούς ποδός* (p. 57), from neuter τ-stems : *σωματότης* (Galen) : *σῶμα-ατος*, and *σχηματότης* (Hermes) : *σχῆμα*.

Derivatives from substantival ν-stems are not found, but there are four from ρ-substantives. The earliest is the inherited Homeric ἀ(ν)δροτής ‘manly vigor’ : ἀνήρ, occurring only in ΙΙ 857 = X 363 λιποῦσ’ ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἥβην and Ω 6 Πατρόκλου ποθέων ἀνδροτῆτά τε καὶ μένος ἡνός. Because of the obvious necessity of a metrically short initial syllable the reading of the manuscripts as quoted has been variously emended, in spite of the fact that Aristarchus accepted it. There is poor MS authority for ἀδροτῆτα (cf. ἀδρός ‘thick, ripe, full-grown’), and if this were the correct reading it would not have been changed to the more difficult ἀνδροτῆτα. Clemm, *Rhein. Mus.* 32. 463 ff., would change λιποῦσ’ ἀνδροτῆτα to λιποῦσα δροτῆτα, and this is adopted by Brugmann, *Gr.* 2. 1.<sup>2</sup> 418, 451, and Boisacq, *Dict. Et. s.v.* This δροτῆτα would have come from \**n̄r-tāt-* : \**n̄r-* = ἀνήρ over \**δρα-tāt-*, with the common assimilation to *-οτητ-* as found also in derivatives from ἄ- stems (p. 58). However, the change to δροτῆτα is metrically impossible for Ω 6, where Clemm had to assume that a later poet imitated the earlier passage which already read ἀνδροτῆτα. Moreover, Wackernagel, *loc. cit.*, has shown that all of the excitement about the short initial syllable of ἀνδροτῆτα is superfluous, for he cites analogies to show that a short vowel before a nasal and “muta cum liquida” may be short metrically, e.g., in ἀβροτάξομεν (Κ 65) : ἀμβροτος. Cf. also Debrunner, *GGA.* 1910. 10 f. It is therefore merely an orthographical question whether we write ἀνδροτῆτα or ἀδροτῆτα, as Prellwitz, *Et. Woerterb.*, and the word is derived from ἀνήρ by all means, although connection was obscured by the pronunciation of the first syllable. If we assume the first sound to have been a short nasal *a* we account for the spelling with and without ν as being different ways of representing the same unfamiliar sound,

and at the same time the metrical irregularity is explained. As a result, however, it is probable that the later ἀνδρότης (Phintys ap. Stobaeus) is not a direct descendant of the Homeric word, but a new independent formation.

The other derivatives from *p*-stems are: *πυρότης* ‘fieriness, heat’ (Galen, Plot.): *πῦρ*, *πατρότης* ‘paternity’ : *πατήρ πατρός*, and *ὑδρότης* ‘moisture’ : *ὕδωρ*. In the last the primitive is treated as in compounds, e.g., *ὑδρο-φόρος*, while in the second *-οτης* is regularly added to the weak stem.

Two words in *-τητ-* come from substantival *σ*-stems: *λιπότης* ‘fatness’ (Aristotle): *τὸ λίπος* ‘fat,’ and *σινότης* ‘faultiness’ (*CGL.*) : *τὸ σῖνος*. Aside from the similar derivatives from adjectives (p. 50) there were two causes: the similarity of the nominative with that of the masculine *o*-declension (cf. *τὸ μέρος* and *ὁ μόρος*), and the patterns offered by the alternation of *o*- and *εσ*-stems as prior members of compounds, e.g., *ειρο-κόμος* : *τὸ εῖρος* and *Κλεό-ξενος* : *τὸ κλέος*.

There is one example of an apparent conglomerate *-ιοτης* : *ἀγγελιότης* ‘angelic nature’ : *ἄγγελος* ‘angel’ owes its *ι* to association with the abstract *ἀγγελία*. Cf. similar derivatives from adjectives (p. 53).

When a word in *-οτης* was apparently derived from a synonymous abstract, it was often due to (usually unconscious) substitution<sup>1</sup> of one equivalent suffix for the other. This is true with more or less probability of the following pairs of words, most of which have been mentioned before: *ληθότης* and *λήθη* ‘forgetfulness,’ *λημότης* and *λήμη* ‘soreness of eyes,’ *οὐσιότης* and *οὐσία* ‘property,’ *ἐντελεύτης* and *ἐντέλεια* ‘perfection,’ *προβιότης* and *προβιοτή* ‘former life,’ *μηκότης* and *τὸ μῆκος* ‘length,’ *ἐνθουσιότης* and *ἐνθουσίασις* and *ἐνθουσιασμός* ‘inspiration.’ The alternating suffix was *-ā* (-η, -ια) in the first four, then one example each of *-τη*, *-εσ-*, *-ασις*, or *-ασμος*.

Derivatives from substantival pronouns are of course like those from nouns. Aristotle has *ταύτοτης* ‘identity’ from the substantival neuter *ταύτο* ‘the same,’ and Proclus *ἴαυτότης* ‘identity’ from the reflexive. Association with the adjectival *αὐτός* facilitated their formation.

3. *-τητ-* in derivatives from adverbs.—Since adjectives in the predicate often compete with adverbs in the expression of one and

<sup>1</sup> For similar substitution of suffixes cf. Petersen, *Gr. Dims. in -ιον* 9 f., 210 ff.

the same idea, and since many adverbs are derived from adjectives, the consequent close association of such a pair of words might lead to the spreading of *-τητ-* from derivatives of adjectival to those of adverbial primitives. Outside of the Greek this happened only in the Avestan, e.g., *avaē-tāt-* as though ‘woeness’ : *avōi* ‘woe!', *yavaē-tāt-* ‘perpetuity’ : *yavōi* ‘forever.’ Between these and the five Greek examples there can be no connection, for the latter are all at least as late as the Roman period and form a rather closely associated group of words derived from adverbs of place.

Two words in *-οτης* come from adverbs whose appearance suggested case-forms of *o*-adjectives: *έκτότης* ‘a being *έκτος*’ i.e. ‘absence’ and *ένδότης* ‘the interior’ : *ένδον* ‘inside.’ The later *έπανωτης* ‘the upper part’ : *έπάνω* ‘above’ was assimilated to the prevailing type<sup>1</sup> of words in *-τητ-*, whereas *\*έπανώτης* would have stood alone.

The two remaining examples end in *-υ-της* because the primitive adverb ended in *v* (*μεταξύτης* ‘interval’ : *μεταξύ*) or looked like the nominative of an *v*-adjective: *έγγύτης* ‘nearness’ : *έγγύς*.

4. *-τητ-* in apparent verbal derivatives.—As opposed to many another suffix *-tāt-* retained its secondary character extremely well, and derivatives from verbs are very rare in Greek and Latin and are unknown in the Aryan languages. Latin has only two certain but evidently artificial examples:<sup>2</sup> *differitās* (Lucr. 4. 636): *differo* and *indulgitās* (Caelius Antipater): *indulgeo*. Greek also has only a very few (mostly doubtful) examples which evidently have no connection with the Latin.

The spread of *-τητ-* to derivatives from verbs implies the existence of patterns which, although formed from nominal primitives, could be associated with a verb secondarily, because they developed the notion of activity which is an intimate bond of association between abstract nouns and verbs of the same root. Thus *φιλότης* may have been sometimes associated with *φιλέω* ‘I love’ instead of *φίλος* when it designated, e.g., ‘friendly service, entertainment,’ as in ο 55 ὅς κεν φιλότητα παράσχῃ. Or *δηιοτής* ‘hostility’ : *δῆιος* became

<sup>1</sup> This was helped by the regular association of adverbs in *-ω* with the *-o*-adjectives from which they were derived.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Stolz, *Hist. Gram.* 555.

'battle-strife, slaughter' and could be referred to δηϊόω 'I slay,' all the more because this meaning was the usual one. On the other hand, ιότης 'will, desire,' although its meaning implies activity, could not be felt as a verbal derivative because no verb to which it could be referred was in existence. We can be most certain of secondary connection with a verb for ποτής 'drinking, drink' (p. 54) < \*ποτο-τητ-: ποτός 'drunk,' originally 'the quality of being drunk,' and then applied to objects characterized by that quality. After the loss of the second syllable connection with the adjective primitive was no longer possible, and it could only be grouped with verb forms like πέπομαι and ἐπέθην.

There are only three<sup>1</sup> probable instances, all of them late, of words in -τητ- which imply association with verbs in formation. From Galen and Jo. Damasc. is cited δακνότης *mordacitas*, for which there is in existence no possible primitive except the verb δάκνω 'bite,' although we cannot ignore the possibility of a primitive adjective, \*δακνός 'biting' being accidentally not quotable. Cf. Angermann, *loc. cit.* Nilus 88 A has φανότης 'brightness,' which was either formed directly from φαίνω 'show,' or else was due to contamination of the regular synonym φāνότης from the adjective φāνός with the verb φαίνω. The very late μεγαλυνότης 'magnitudo' must without question be referred to the verb μεγαλύνω 'exalt.'

Other instances are only apparent. For δρσότης, which suggests δρνυμι, see page 52. As to ἐνανθρωπότης 'incarnation' (Cyrillus), which seems to be derived from the verb ἐνανθρωπέω, it was more probably a true adjectival abstract and felt as 'the condition of being among men,' presupposing either an adjective \*ἐνάνθρωπος<sup>2</sup> 'among men,' or else the assumption of the existence of such a word. It may also have arisen through the influence of the simplex ἀνθρωπότης on ἐνανθρωπησίς 'incarnation.'

5. *The accent of words in -τητ-.*—All except nine Greek words in -τητ- accent the preceding ο or υ, e.g., κακότης, φιλότης, ὡκύτης, γλυκύτης, τραπεζότης, ἔκτότης. This corresponds to the accentua-

<sup>1</sup> If the reading δενδρότης· ή τῶν δένδρων αὔξησις in Suidas is correct, we have here a fourth example. Only if formed from the verb δενδρόμαι 'to grow to a tree' would this meaning be intelligible.

<sup>2</sup> Probably ἐνανθρωπέω is itself a denominative from \*ἐνάνθρωπος.

tion of all except two of the Sanskrit words in *-tāt(i)-* which occur in accented texts, e.g., *sarvātāt-*, *devātāt-*, *vasútātī-*. The exceptions, *ástatātī-* and *dákṣatātī-*, accent the root syllable. Since this type would have been changed to the regular type in Greek because of the operation of the law of three syllables (e.g. \*δέξιοτης > δεξιότης, \*δέξιοτητος > δεξιότητος), it would seem that the original place of the accent must have been either the final syllable of the primitive stem or the root.

However, an examination of the Greek exceptions throws doubt on this simple conclusion, for five of the nine Homeric words accent the *-τητ-*, showing that there was then no tendency whatever to adhere to the later rule. These are: ἀ(ν)δροτής, βραδυτής, ταχυτής, ποτής, δηϊοτής. The later exceptions<sup>1</sup> are: τραχυτής (Aeschylus+), also accented τραχύτης, δανοτής (Sophocles), and πινυτᾶς (*Anth. Pal.*). There are also traces of an accentuation κουφοτής (regular κούφότης) in Attic, from which Wackernagel, *loc. cit.* 59, draws the conclusion that its opposite βαρύτης, the only possible pattern for its accent, should really be βαρυτής.

The explanation offered by Wackernagel, *loc. cit.* 50 ff., is an alleged IE law according to which an *i*, *u*, or *r* preceding a suffix could not take the accent, which would then be shifted to the following syllable. Thus, cf. Skt. *purutáma-* and *purú-*, *r̥bhumiánt-* and *r̥bhú-*. Homeric *βραδυτής*, *ταχυτής*, and ἀ(ν)δροτής (: \*nṛ-) would therefore show the inherited accent just as would *νεότης*, *κακότης*, and *φιλότης* for derivatives from *o*-stems. The Attic, it is claimed, retained traces of this law in *τραχυτής* and \*βαρυτής, whereas examples contradicting the same were either accented falsely by the scribes or due to analogy of other words.

Without entering on a discussion of all the minute and subtle arguments adduced, we may well admit this much, that there was a general IE tendency not to accent *i*, *u*, or *r*, since these vowels were the reduced grade of fuller vowels and were due to loss of accent. Cf. Debrunner, *Griech. Wortbild.* 77. It was, however, merely a tendency, and continually offset by analogy, congeneric assimilation, etc., so

<sup>1</sup> Also *πρεσβυτᾶς* is found, e.g., in Liddell and Scott, but this is pure conjecture. Since it occurs only in an inscription of the third or second century B.C. its accentuation is unknown, but probably regular.

that we need not expect a difference of this kind ever maintained consistently either in IE or Greek times. In the formation of every word its patterns are a much more powerful influence than vague phonetic tendencies, and it is by association with other words that, not only the exceptions, but the regular words must largely be explained. Wackernagel himself explained *κουφοτής* as patterned after \**βαρυτής*, but we may just as well explain *τραχυτής* as patterned after the similar sounding *ταχυτής*, and *δανοτής* is not made suspicious by its following the accent of *δηιοτής*, but is doing what every new word had to do.

Nor is the influence of associated word on accent confined to words in *-τητ-*. Since it displaced an earlier *-τā-*, the two suffixes must at one time have been found alongside of each other in some words, and this would lead to the later words following the accent of the earlier as found, e.g., in *πινυτή*, *βιοτή*, *ἀντή*, *γενετή*. Thus *πινυτάς* may have received its accent from *πινυτή*, and in prehistoric times, e.g., \**δηιοτή* or \**ταχυτή* may have caused *δηιοτής* or *ταχυτής*. Even other associated words with accented suffix might have been contributing factors, e.g., *έδωδή*, *έδωδός*, *βρωτός* for *ποτής*; *ἀντή*, *φονή*, *κυδοιμός* for *δηιοτής*; *ἀλκή* for *ἀ(ν)δροτής*; *σπουδή* for *ταχυτής*.

6. *Some semantic aspects of -τητ-.*—As far as the mere occurrence of meanings is concerned, one may expect the same types for *-τητ-* as for other suffixes forming adjectival abstracts. They all usually designate an attribute or state or condition suggested by the primitive adjective, but sometimes, on the one hand, come to designate an action, which brings them in contact with verbal abstracts, sometimes, on the other hand, become concrete and designate either objects or individual persons or groups (collectives) characterized by the quality of the primitive adjective.<sup>1</sup> If *-τητ-* displays any important peculiarity of use, it is merely this, that in contrast to most suffixes of the kind these developments are of the greatest rarity. More than any other formative *-τητ-* has the definite function of forming abstracts from adjectives and of designating an attribute or state with only a rare variation due to the development of individual words and influence of equivalent suffixes.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Brugmann, *op. cit.*, 641 f.

The most characteristic function of an adjectival abstract and the one farthest removed from verbal ones is the designation of a permanent characteristic or attribute. This function is shown, e.g., in the following groups of words from the Classical period: words designating color or brightness, as ἐρυθρότης and πυρρότης 'redness,' χλωρότης 'greenness,' γλαυκότης 'blueness, greyness,' πολιότης 'greyness,' λευκότης 'whiteness,' μελανότης 'blackness,' λαμπρότης 'brightness,' φαιότης 'darkness'; words designating taste qualities, as γλυκύτης 'sweetness,' ὀξύτης and στρυφότης 'sourness,' ἀλμυρότης and ἀλυκότης 'saltiness,' πικρότης 'bitterness'; words designating qualities given by the cutaneous senses, as βαρύτης 'heaviness,' κουφότης 'lightness,' ἀπαλότης, μαλακότης, and μαλθακότης 'softness,' σκληρότης and στερεότης 'hardness,' ἀμβλύτης 'bluntness,' τραχύτης 'sharpness,' στερρότης 'solidity,' ὑγρότης 'liquidity,' θερμότης 'warmth,' ψυχρότης 'coldness'; words designating speed of movement, as βραδυτής 'slowness,' ταχυτής and ὡκύτης 'swiftness'; words designating spatial attributes, as μακρότης 'length,' βραχύτης 'shortness,' εὐρύτης 'width,' στενότης 'narrowness,' παχύτης 'thickness,' λεπτότης 'thinness,' μικρότης 'smallness,' εὐθύτης 'straightness,' βλαισότης and καμπυλότης 'crookedness,' στρογγυλότης 'roundness,' κυρτότης 'convexity,' κοιλότης 'concavity'; words designating mental and moral qualities of man, as δεξιότης and δεινότης 'cleverness,' σκαιότης 'awkwardness,' φαυλότης 'want of skill, meanness,' κακότης 'badness, cowardice,' χρηστότης 'goodness,' κοσμιότης 'orderliness,' ἀθέότης 'ungodliness,' ἀνδρειότης 'manliness, daring,' θρασύτης 'audaciousness,' πραῦτης and ἡμερότης 'mildness,' χαλεπότης 'severity,' ἀγριότης and ὡμότης 'fierceness, cruelty,' ὀργιλότης 'irascibility,' αὐστηρότης 'crabbedness,' σκυθρωπότης 'sullenness,' σεμνότης 'dignity,' χαυνότης 'vanity,' ἵταμότης 'recklessness,' σχολαιότης 'slowness,' ὁσιότης 'religiousness,' ἀνοσιότης 'profaneness,' ἔλευθεριότης 'liberality,' ἀνελευθεριότης 'illiberality.'

Similar abstracts derived from substantives may denote an attribute or group of attributes considered essential to the meaning of the substantive. Often these are due to sophisticated philosophical abstraction, as in Plato *κναθότης* 'abstract nature of cup' and *τραπεζότης* 'abstract quality of a table,' in Aristotle *ποδότης* 'abstract quality of [having] feet' and *πτερότης* 'abstract quality of

wings.' Later, *ἱππότης* 'horse-nature, concept of a horse,' *πλινθότης* 'brickness,' *συνανθρωπότης* 'joint nature of man,' *σωματότης* 'corporality,' *ἱλότης* 'materiality,' *ψυχότης* 'spirituality.' Others look more natural, even though many of these were no doubt coined consciously. Aristotle has *θηριότης* 'bestiality' and *λιπότης* 'fatness.' Later are ἀγγελότης 'nature of the angels,' ἀνδρότης<sup>1</sup> 'manliness,' διαβολότης 'devilishness,' ζῷότης 'animal nature,' θεότης 'divine nature,' κυκλότης<sup>2</sup> 'circularity,' νοότης 'intellectuality,' ὄφιότης 'snakelike nature,' Σεβαστότης 'dignity of Σεβαστός,' Χριστότης 'nature of Christ, Christhood.'

For similar words formed from nouns of relationship the suffix probably became the bearer of this part of the meaning, as in ἀνεψιότης 'cousinship,' ἀδελφότης 'relation of brothers and sisters,' νιότης 'sonhood.'

Between a permanent attribute and a temporary or at least inessential state or condition no hard-and-fast line can be drawn. Very many adjectives and adjectival abstracts denote now one, now the other, varying according to the object referred to or other conditions. Thus 'white' and 'whiteness' designate an attribute of snow, but a state or condition of the human hair, 'coldness' an attribute of ice, but a condition of the human body, Gr. *κακότης* an attribute when used of men's character (B 368), but a condition when used of distress or misery (ε 414); *ταπεινότης* 'lowness' is an attribute when used of land (Diod. 1. 31), but a condition when applied to the miserable plight of the Athenians at Syracuse in Thuc. 7. 75.

The following words (from the Classical period unless stated otherwise) designate a state or condition exclusively or at least ordinarily; *νεότης* 'youth,' *ηπιότης* 'childhood,' *πρεσβύτερος* (CIG. 2448. 4. 28, 6. 29) 'age'; *ἐνεότης* 'dumbness,' *κωφότης* 'deafness,' *τυφλότης* 'blindness,' *χωλότης* (first in Plutarch) 'lameness'; *ἀθλιότης* 'wretchedness,' *μακαρίότης* 'happiness,' *μαργότης* 'raging passion, madness,' *ἀλλοτριότης* 'estrangement'; *ἀκρατότης* 'unmixed state,'

<sup>1</sup> Probably not a direct descendant of Homeric *ἀ(ν)δροτής* with short initial syllable. See p. 60.

<sup>2</sup> Association with the adjective *κύκλιος* 'circular' may have played a part in the formation of this word.

ἐτοιμότης ‘preparedness,’ κενότης ‘emptiness,’ ξηρότης ‘dryness,’ θολερότης ‘muddiness,’ σπανιότης ‘scarcity,’ σαπρότης ‘putridity.’

Also two of the derivatives from adverbs (chap. iii) designate a condition: ἐγγύτης ‘nearness’ and ἔκτότης ‘absence.’ Others again are derived from substantives. When the primitive itself is abstract the meaning of the derivative differs little if at all. Thus λοιμότης ‘pestilent condition’ is close to λοιμός ‘pestilence,’ σινότης ‘faultiness’ to τὸ σίνος ‘fault, harm,’ λημότης ‘soreness of eyes’ is equivalent to λήμη, σχηματότης to σχῆμα. Here, of course, it will be difficult to distinguish from congeneric attraction and substitution of suffixes.

When the primitive is concrete the derivative distinctly designates a condition or state whose essential characteristics are those of the primitive substantive, as πυρότης ‘fiery condition, heat’: πῦρ ‘fire,’ βορβορότης ‘muddiness’: βόρβορος. Oftener the primitive designates a person: παιδιότης ‘childhood’: παιδίον, ἐφηβότης ‘puberty’: ἐφηβος, νεανιότης ‘youth’: νεανίας, γραβότης ‘old-womanhood’: γραῦς, πατρότης ‘paternity’: πατήρ, ἑταῖρότης ‘companionship’: ἑταῖρος, ἀπελευθερότης ‘state of a freedman’: ἀπελεύθερος. A special group designates the official position of some dignitary: ἀρχιερότης ‘high-priesthood,’ ἐπαρχότης ‘the government of the ἐπαρχος or prefect,’ ὑπαρχότης ‘office of the ὑπαρχος,’ καθολικότης ‘office of the καθολικός or controller,’ μαγιστρότης ‘office of the μάγιστρος.’ None of these words antedate the Christian Era.

One of the principal semantic points of contact of adjectival abstracts is with action nouns or verbal abstracts, inasmuch as the notion of an attribute or permanent quality can easily pass over into that of an intermittent quality or of an activity which is the result of such a quality.<sup>1</sup> This development has not been undergone by those abstracts which are derived from adjectives expressing a tendency to certain kinds of action, at least not as long as the tendency is stressed, for such a tendency is a true attribute. Thus ἴταμότης ‘tendency to go forward’ (cf. εἰμι), δργιλότης ‘tendency to anger, irascibility’ (cf. δργίζω), πιθανότης ‘persuasiveness’ (cf.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Paul, *Principien der Sprachgeschichte*, 335.

*πείθω), μιμηλότης* ‘imitativeness’ (cf. *μιμέομαι*), even though indirectly associated with the verbs mentioned, are true adjectival abstracts of *ἰταμός, ὄργιλος, πιθανός, μιμηλός*.

The action itself came to be designated, probably regularly, by the following words already mentioned: Homeric *ἴότης* and *δημοτής* (pp. 61 f.), *δανοτής* (Sophocles, p. 52), and *ὄρσότης* (p. 52). As a word which was an action noun occasionally was mentioned Homeric *φιλότης* (p. 61), to which might be added *ποτής* (Δ 780?). Other examples of an occasional idea of activity from the Classical period are: *βιαιότης* ‘violence’ used of bringing a man before the courts in Antiph. 130. 16 *ἡ τούτων βιαιότης καὶ παρανομία.* *κουφότης* ‘lightness’ is ‘lightening, relief’ (*μόχθων*) Eur. frg. 119. *λαμπρότης* ‘brightness, splendor’ is ‘splendid conduct’ in Dem. 565. 22 *τίς οὖν ἡ λαμπρότης, ἢ τίνες αἱ λητουργίαι καὶ τὰ σέμν' ἀναλώματα τούτου;* *οἰκειότης* ‘friendliness’ is rendered ‘living together’ Isocr. 216 C *εἶλετο τὴν οἰκειότητα Ἐλένης.* *παραφορότης* ‘awkwardness’ (only Plato Tim. 87 E) rather denotes awkward movements: *διὰ τὴν παραφορότητα πτώματα παρέχον.*

Later examples of words in *-τητ-* with the notion of activity are: *αἰχρότης* ‘ugliness’ in the sense of ‘fellatio,’ Schol. Ar. Ran. 1308. *ἀλέοτης* ‘an assemblage,’ Galen *Lex. Hippocr.* *δεξιότης* in the sense ‘greeting,’ Paus. 7. 7. 5 *προπίνειν . . . . ἐπὶ δεξιότητι.* *δολιότης* in the sense ‘deceitful action,’ LXX Ps. 37. 13 *δολιότητας ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἐμελέτησαν.* *ἐλεεινότης* in the meaning ‘pity,’ Schol. Eur. Or. 960. *κραταιότης* in the meaning ‘power,’ LXX Ps. 45. 4 *ἐταράχθησαν τὰ ὅρη ἐν τῇ κραταιότητι αὐτοῦ.* Similarly *κυριότης* ‘dominion’ in Col. 1. 16 *εἴτε κυριότητες<sup>1</sup> εἴτε ἀρχαὶ εἴτε ἔξουσίαι.* *ληρότης* as ‘foolish talk,’ Schol. Ar. Nub. 783. *προβιότης* ‘a former life or way of living,’ e.g., Clem. Al. 460 *ἔξ θηνῶν καὶ τὴς προβιότητος ἐκείνης ἐπὶ τὴν πίστιν ὀρμήσας.*

Because these words approached the category of action nouns occasionally they were not necessarily felt as verbal derivatives, and as often as not a probably associated verb was not even in existence. On the other hand, such secondary association with verbs might be possible even in spite of the existence of real nominal primitives in

<sup>1</sup> Here the plural seems to be an indication of the idea of activity, i.e. it represents different manifestations of a quality, which brings it close to the verbal idea.

cases like *ληρότης* (with *ληρέω*), *οἰκουρότης* (with *οἰκουρέω*), and *προβιότης* (with *προβιόω*). In so far as a few real derivatives in -τητ- from verbs seem to have been patterned after such instances, they have been mentioned in chapter iv.

Although it is a natural and common development for adjectival abstracts to become collectives, inasmuch as the word designating an attribute may be used to designate everything characterized by such an attribute, collective use of Gr. -τητ- is very rare and never became productive in any sense of the word. This is in distinct contrast to Lat. *-tāt-*, which shows such common examples as *civitās* ‘state’ : *civis* ‘citizen,’ *nobilitās* ‘nobility,’ *familiaritās* ‘friends.’ The only Classical example of collective use of Gr. -τητ- is *νεότης* ‘youth,’ which, though usually abstract, is repeatedly used of young men, first in Pindar I. 8. 150. In Crete this use actually became stereotyped, so that ὁ *νεότας* designated a body of young men in an official position, a counterpart to the *γερουσία* of Sparta. Compare the inscriptions *SGDI* 5011 f. (first half of third century B.C.). Later examples of collectives designating persons are *ἀδελφότης* ‘brotherhood’ as used in the New Testament (I Pet. 2. 17; 5. 9) and *ἀνθρωπότης* ‘humanity,’ which means ‘genus humanum’ as used by Philo (*qu. det.* 21).

A collective also is *μυριότης*, equivalent to *μυριάς* in the phrase *ἐν μυριότητι* ‘countless times’ (LXX *Sap.* 12. 22). Possibly also *καρδιότης* ‘praecordia’ (Gloss.): *καρδία* ‘heart’ would be somehow a derailment of the collective use, but it looks as though -οτης was a suffix of appurtenance. Since no citation is given, so that we are ignorant of its exact application, since it is utterly without analogy, and since we do not even find a possibly associated word which might have served as pattern, it is useless to attempt an explanation, and probably it was a false form.

Equally rare is the use of abstracts in -τητ- to designate individual persons, except when due to conscious metonymy. The only instance before late Roman times seems to be *φιλότης* ‘love’ as presupposed by the diminutive *φιλοττάριον*<sup>1</sup> *αὐλῆτα* ‘darling flute-player’

<sup>1</sup> Aside from the hypocoristic doubling of the τ, this word is irregular because the primitive *φιλότης* appears to have been treated like a -τη- stem, which is intelligible because nominative vocative singular did not show the second τ in *φιλοτητ-*, and in the use here presupposed the other cases occurred only rarely.

in Aristophanes (*Eccl.* 891). Cf. also Nicet. *Poet.* 1. 278 *νυκτὶ πεισθῆναι με, φιλότης, πρέπει.* Akin to the use of Eng. *godhead* and *divinity* of the supreme being himself is the ecclesiastical *αὐτοθεότης* ‘Very Godhead’: *αὐτόθεος*. From the association of the person with his office comes the use of *ἐπαρχότης* of the prefect himself (Lyd. *De Mag.* 2. 9) *ἀποδέχονται γονυπετεῖς τὴν ἐπαρχότητα.* Conscious personification is at the basis of the proper names *Νεότης* ‘goddess of Youth’ (Dion. H. 1. 586. 5, Dion. C. 54. 19. 7) and *Μακαριότης* ‘Blessedness,’ name of a Valentian Aeon, the spouse of *Ἐκκλησιαστικός* (Iren. 449 B). We may compare *Κακία* ‘Vice’ and *Ἀρετή* ‘Virtue,’ in the allegory of Hercules at the cross-roads (Xen. *Mem.* 2. 1. 21 ff.), and *Μνημοσύνη* ‘Memory,’ the mother of the Muses.

Very productive, on the other hand, was the use of words in *-τητ-* as titles in the late Roman and Byzantine periods, particularly in addressing the emperor and other dignitaries in that spirit of adulation which was so characteristic of those times,<sup>1</sup> and of which we still have the remnants in the Eng. addresses ‘Your Honor,’ ‘Your Highness,’ etc. I have found quoted the following examples: *ἀγαθότης* ‘Goodness’ (Basil., Greg. Naz.), *ἀγιότης* ‘Holiness’ (Ephes.), *παναγιότης* ‘All-holiness’ (modern, see Kum.), *ἀδελφότης* ‘Brotherliness’ (Synes.), *αἰωνίότης* ‘Eternity’ (Chal.), *αἰδεσιμότης* ‘Venerableness’ (papyri, see Herwerden), *γαληνότης* ‘Serenity’ (Evagr., Pseud. Basil.), *γενναιότης* ‘Valorousness’ (Porphyry.), *γλυκύτης* ‘Suavity’ (Theoph.), *γνησιότης* ‘Nobleness’ (Basil.), *δεξιότης* ‘Dexterity’ (Greg. Naz.), *ἐνδοξότης* ‘Gloriousness’ (Nil.), *ἡμερότης* ‘Kindness’ (Euseb., Athan.), *θαυμασιότης* ‘Wonderfulness’ (*CIG.* 3467. 10, Chrys.), *θειότης* ‘Divinity’ (Euseb.), *ἱερότης* ‘Holiness’ (Tzetz.), *καθαρότης* ‘Purity’ (Euseb.), *κορυφαίότης* ‘Headship’ (Th. Stud.), *κοσμιότης* ‘Discreetness’ (Basil.), *κυριότης* ‘Lordship’ (Greg.), *λαμπρότης* ‘Splendor’ (Athan.), *ἐκλαμπρότης* ‘Exceeding Splendor’ (late Byz.), *λογιότης* ‘Eloquence’ (Basil.), *μακαριότης* ‘Blessedness’ (e.g., Cod. Justin.), *μεγαλειότης* ‘Majesty’ (Ps. Nicod.), *μεγαλοδοξότης* ‘Celebrity’ (Eustath.), *δσιότης* ‘Holiness’ (Eus., Evagr.), *περιβλεπτότης* ‘Celebrity’ (*PB.* 547. 3), *ποθεινότης* ‘Desirableness’ (Maxim. Conf.), *σεμνότης* ‘Dignity’ (Athan., Euseb.), *στερρότης* ‘Firmness’

<sup>1</sup> For the similar use of Latin abstracts cf. Schmalz, *Lat. Gram.* 4 605 f.

(Euseb.), *στιβαρότης* 'Firmness' (*ibid.*), *τελειότης* 'Perfection' (Basil., Greg. Naz.), *τιμιότης* 'Honor' (Athan., Basil.), *χρηστότης* 'Excellence' (Athan., Basil.).

The converse of this occurs when derogatory abstracts are in assumed humility applied to himself by the person speaking, as in the German 'meine Wenigkeit.' So *ἀναξιότης* 'unworthiness' (Nicet Byzant.), *ἐλαχιστότης* 'exceeding smallness' (Jo. Jejun.), *οὐθενότης* 'nothingness' (Isid.), *πλαγιότης* (Greg. Naz.) and *ταπεινότης* (Epiph.) 'humility,' *στυγνότης* 'hatefulness' (Cyrill.). Cf. Wundt, *Sprachpsych.*<sup>3</sup> 2. 47 for all of these titular designations.

Adjectival abstracts come to designate non-personal and non-collective concrete objects when quality and object are so continually associated as to cause identification, most frequently when a quality in an object is caused by some matter scattered through it or appearing in a certain part or parts. The moisture of the air may be either the condition of being moist or the vapor which causes this condition, the latter when Plato *Phil.* 32 A speaks of freezing of the moisture (*τῆς ὑγρότητος πῆξις*). The quality of fatness may be identified with the material which is its cause, and so *λιπαρότης* 'fatness' is used of fatty substance (in the plural) by Hippocrates *Prognost.* 12. Similarly *ρυπαρότης* is 'filth' as well as 'filthiness,' *ρυστότης* either 'wrinkledness' or 'wrinkles.' Only slightly different are words like *κνιπέτης* (Hippocrates), which will inevitably be referred to the inflamed spot on the eye as well as to the inflammation itself. Identical later examples are: *έφηλότης*<sup>1</sup> (Sext. Emp.), used of a white speck on the eye, and *πελιδνότης*<sup>1</sup> (Aretae.) and *πελιότης*<sup>1</sup> (Oribas.) of a livid spot.

Abstracts designating a position may denote that which occupies the position. Eng. *neighborhood* (Gr. *πλησιότης* or *γειτνιότης*) refers to the neighboring region as well as the condition of nearness. Gr. *ἀκρότης* may designate an extremity, as Arist. *Plant.* 2. 9 *ἀπὸ τῆς ὑγρότητος τῆς ἐλκούσης τὸ γάλα ἔκεινο εἰς τὰς ἀκρότητας.* Cf. also *ἐνδότης* (Ps. Dion., Max. Conf.) 'the interior,' *ἐπανότης* (Epiph.) 'the upper part,' and *μεταξύτης* (Sext. Emp.) 'the interval.'

<sup>1</sup> Not every word in -τητ- was necessarily abstract when first formed. Those which were patterned after others that had become concrete were concrete from the beginning. These words e.g. are not found as abstracts.

The last word has been given as showing the same development as the others, although it may not be concrete in *every* sense of the term. The same is true of *μεσότης* 'middle space, realm of Demiurgus' (Ptol., Iren.), otherwise 'middle position,' *κενέότης* (Hippocr.) in the sense 'void,' else 'emptiness,' *κοιλότης* (Aristotle) as 'a hollow' instead of 'hollowness', or when certain abstracts like *κοινότης* : *κοινός* 'common' and *λιτότης* : *λιτός* 'plain' become designations of figures of speech.

Singular cases of concrete words in *-τητ-* are : *βιότης* (h. Hom.) 'livelihood' (see p. 51), *ποτής* (Homer) 'drink,' which became concrete either as suggested, p. 54, or over the verbal abstract stage 'drinking,' *ἐπαρχότης* (p. 67) 'office or jurisdiction of the prefect' when used of the district under his power, and *ποσότης* 'quantity' when applied to a definite sum: *IG. 14. 956 A 11 τὴν ποσότητα πᾶσαν εἰσενεγκεῖν.*

**7. *-τητ-* and its rival suffixes.**—All of these occasional variations of the use of *-τητ-*, particularly those of the Classical period, form an exceedingly small part of its total occurrences, and neither concrete nor verbal uses became independently productive. It thus had the advantage of being almost exclusively a suffix for forming abstract words denoting an attribute or condition, differing from some of its rivals in the absence of competing uses, from others merely in the emotional tone or sphere of usage.

The most frequent rival of *-τητ-* is *-ιā*, which is found in the same uses throughout the history of the language. However, *-ιā*, forming the substantivized feminine of adjectives in *-ιος*, is used freely in a large number of shades of meaning foreign to *-τητ-*, as well as in those meanings secondary to that of the attribute or condition, which were so rare for the latter. Leaving out of account its most frequent use in living feminine adjectives, there are substantival uses still showing adjectival origin, e.g., the proper name *Ἐστία*, the goddess of the hearth, *αι θαλάσσιαι*, of priestesses at Cyzicus (: *θάλαττα*), *ἡ πολεμία* (sc. *χώρα*) 'the enemy's country.' In contrast to *-τητ-* a large number of abstracts in *-ιā* develop the notion of action, e.g., *ἀγγελία* 'message,' *σωτηρία* 'rescue,' *ξενία* 'hospitable entertainment,' *κακουργία* 'evil-doing,' *ώφελία*<sup>1</sup> (e.g., *IG. 1. 85. 3*) 'help,' to mention only a few

<sup>1</sup> Alongside occurs *ώφελεια*, both forms being guaranteed by the meter in some passages. Cf. Liddell and Scott s.v.

from the Classical period, while other similar abstracts are even of primary formation, e.g., *μανία* : *μαίνομαι* 'I am mad,' *πενία* : *πένομαι* 'I am poor.' Similarly, collectives are represented by numerous old and common examples like *φρατρία* 'brotherhood, clan,' *έταιρία* 'club,' *κοπρία* 'dunghill' (: *κόπρος* 'dung'), *οἰκία* 'house' (: *οἶκος* 'room'). Of the many other unambiguously concrete words might be mentioned *έστια* 'hearth,' *κονία* 'dust,' *κοιλία* 'belly,' *οὐσία* 'wealth, property.' Aside from this difference of the greater extent of its sphere of usage, it seems that words in *-ā* were more popular and free from the frigid learned tone which characterized most of those in *-τητ-*. See pp. 74 f.

Of the occasionally competing suffixes I shall mention only *-εσ-*,<sup>1</sup> which, although found in different uses in the great majority of words, forms a group of synonyms to words in *-υτης*. They were mostly of early poetic origin and were being displaced in prose by words in *-τητ-*. Cf. the following pairs with writers in which first found: *εῦρος* (Homer) and *εὐρύτης* (Hippocrates), *θράσος* (Homer) and *θρασύτης* (Hippocrates, Thucydides), *πάχος* (Homer) and *παχύτης* (Herodotus), *βάρος* (Aeschylus) and *βαρύτης* (Thucydides), *βάθος* (Aeschylus) and *βαθύτης* (Lucian), *πλάτος* (Simonides ?) and *πλατύτης* (Hippocrates). On the other hand, both *τάχος* and *ταχυτής* are Homeric, while *βράδος*, found first in Xenophon, is even opposed to *βραδύτης* in Homer, and *δάσος* (Alciphron) is later than *δασύτης* (Aristotle). There are also three similar already Homeric words which are derived from irregular adjectives and are displaced by later forms in *-οτης* instead of *-υτης*. Cf. *μῆκος* and *μηκότης* (Galen) and *μακρότης* (Aristotle), *κάλλος* and *καλότης* (Chrysippus), *μέγεθος* and *μεγαλότης* (Chrysippus).<sup>2</sup>

The only suffix of any importance which competes with *-τητ-* and forms only or almost exclusively abstract words, is *-συνη*, e.g. in *δικαιοσύνη* = *δικαιότης*. Even here, however, there are important differences of detail. We have seen (p. 49) that *-τητ-* is found in only twelve derivatives from *v*-stems (all adjectival), and of these only three were from the Classical period. On the other hand, *-συνη*

<sup>1</sup> That *-εσ-* has the appearance of a primary suffix does not affect the fact of its competition with *-τητ-*. These words are adjectival abstracts from the semantic point of view, which, moreover, is a point in favor of Hirt, *IF*. 32. 230 ff., who maintains *-εσ-* to have been a secondary suffix originally.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Lobbeck and Phrynicus 350 for such words.

is found in 156<sup>1</sup> derivatives (including some from substantives) from *v*-stems, as against 122 from all other kinds of primitives. Thus less than 2 per cent of words in *-τητ-* are derived from *v*-stems, but over 56 per cent of those in *-συνη*. The latter include such old and common words as *μνημοσύνη* : *μνήμων* and *σωφροσύνη* : *σώφρων*.

On the semantic side *-συνη*, in contrast to *-τητ-*, has a leaning toward a dynamic meaning, and is commonly used to express abstract ideas which involve action, in spite of the fact that the primitives are regularly adjectives and substantives, as also for *-τητ-*. I shall quote only the unambiguous Homeric examples: *δαιτροσύνη* ‘art of carving meat,’ *δουλοσύνη* ‘slavish work’ (χ 423), *ἱπποσύνη* ‘horsemanship,’ *κλεπτοσύνη* ‘thievery,’ *μαντοσύνη* ‘art of divination,’ *ξενοσύνη* ‘hospitality,’ *παλαισμοσύνη* ‘wrestling,’ *πλαγκτοσύνη* ‘roaming,’ *ταρβοσύνη* ‘fright,’ *τεκτοσύνη* ‘carpentry,’ *τοξοσύνη* ‘archery.’ These alone greatly exceed the total of instances of *-τητ-* words with that shade of use (p. 68).

Partially perhaps because of the greater picturesqueness of such words compared to the mere sober abstraction of a quality, but also for other reasons, *-συνη* appears as a suffix of poetic tone, differing, on the one hand, from the more colloquial flavor of *-ιā*, on the other hand, from the frigidity and learned tone of *-τητ-* in most words. Not that every example of the latter was an unpoetic word. Not only are nine of them found in Homer, but the later Classical poets are first sources for twenty-one additional ones. The unpoetic flavor would not cling to old words which were in such common use that even the poets could not get along without them, such words as the Homeric *κακότης*, *νεότης*, and *φιλότης*. Nor would new formations by the poets partake of that flavor if associated with other poetic words in *-τητ-*. Thus *δανοτής* (p. 52), made by Sophocles by analogy to the Homeric *δηϊοτής*, would, because of its association with the latter, be a poetic word. Usually, however, words in *-τητ-* were distinctly prosaic words, and it was quite rare for poets to venture new formations. Less than 15 per cent of *-τητ-* abstracts of the Classical period appear for the first time in the poets, and it is

<sup>1</sup> At least 27 of these have no immediate primitive, but are made by analogy to other derivatives from *v*-stems. So, e.g., *ἀλιτοφροσύνη* after words like *ἀφροσύνη*: *ἀφρων* and *σωφροσύνη*: *σώφρων*, even though *\*ἀλιτόφρων* does not occur.

not probable that many of these were actually formed by them, for they designate characteristics like goodness, bravery, swiftness, and slowness, which would be noticed by everyone, a fact which points toward popular origin. Most of them were therefore words of general currency, many of which are met for the first time in poets simply because at the time of the epic and lyric poets and Aeschylus there was as yet no prose literature in which they could appear. On the other hand, sixty-six of eighty-eight Classical words in *-συνη*, or 75 per cent, are found for the first time in poetry, and of the twenty-two for which prose is the earliest source, all except five<sup>1</sup> were derived from *v*-stems, for which, as we have seen, it was the regular abstract-forming suffix. It was, then, just as rare for prose writers to venture to coin or use new words in *-συνη* (except derivatives from *v*-stems) as for poets to use new words in *-τητ-*.

The latter suffix was the favorite, not so much of prose writers in general, as of those who did much conscious abstraction; it was the suffix of philosophy and science. In the Classical period the three principal representatives of these branches of literature, Plato, Aristotle, and the physician Hippocrates (and his school), are first sources for 139 (about 68 per cent) of the entire number of words in *-τητ-*. Of these forty-six occur for the first time in the works attributed to Hippocrates, thirty-eight<sup>2</sup> in Plato, fifty-five<sup>2</sup> in Aristotle, while Herodotus shows only nine new words in *-τητ-*, Thucydides seven, Xenophon twelve, and all the orators ten.

Another evidence of the unpopular character of *-τητ-* is its rareness in the papyri. Cf. Mayser, *Gram. d. gr. Pap.* 444, who declares that no new formations occur at all. This, however, should be qualified somewhat, for *ἀφηλικότης* (cf. Herwerden *s.v.*) is found only in a papyrus, and *αιδεσιμότης* and *περιβλεπτότης*, while registered in Stephanus, are known from actual texts only through papyri.

In the inscriptions the status of *-τητ-* is practically as in the papyri. The official documents of which so many of them consist

<sup>1</sup> For four of these Herodotus is the earliest source, and the fifth is quoted from the Ionian Democritus.

<sup>2</sup> Since later works also pass under the name of Hippocrates, the occurrence of some words in Plato and Aristotle may be earlier than in the pseudo-Hippocrates.

would avoid new words of all kinds because of their conservative style. Nevertheless, it so happens that ἀνεψιότης is found centuries before its appearance in literature in the old law of Draco, quoted in *IG.* 1. 61, and one word (*πρεσβύτᾶς CIG.* 2448. 4. 28, 6. 29) occurs only in this one inscription. In the dialect inscriptions -τητ- is particularly rare, and in the whole collection of Collitz-Bechtel I have found only νέότᾶς (5011. 9, 5012. 6, Crete), οἰκειότᾶς<sup>1</sup> (46. 4, Messene, 5042. 4, Crete), and φιλότης (3611. 4, Cos).<sup>2</sup> The other inscriptions also have a rather small number of examples, but not a single new formation, except *πρεσβύτᾶς* just mentioned. Of the other examples one group is found in metrical inscriptions, which betrays Homeric influence, as do also these words themselves: νέότης (*IG.* 12. 9. 1195, Oreus; 9. 2. 648. 6, Larissa Pel.), φιλότης (*IG.* 12. 5. 591. 5, Ceos; 7. 1885. 3, Boeotia), ταχυτῆς (*IG.* 12. 7. 117. 11, Arcesine), ίότης (*CIG.* 3557, Mysia), βιότης (*CIG.* 6206, 6290, Rome). The remaining examples seem to belong mostly to the conventional language of official documents or of the church: ἀγνότης (*CIG.* 1133. 15, Argos), ἀνθρωπότης (*CIG.* 8964), ἀρχαιότης (Ditt<sup>2</sup>. 376. 42, Edict of Nero to Corinth), δεινότης (*IG.* 12. 2. 46. 6, Mytilene), θαυμασιότης (*CIG.* 3467. 10), θεότης (*CIG.* 8964), ισότᾶς (*IG.* 5. 1. 1432. 41, 43, Messene), καθαρειότᾶς (*IG.* 5. 1. 1432. 10, 15, 43, Messene), καθαριότης (probably *IG.* 12. 8. 16. 10, Hephaestia), κοσμιότης (Ditt<sup>2</sup>. 519. 31, 38, 58, Athens; *IG.* 12. 7. 240. 18, Minoa; etc.), λαμπρότης (e.g. *IG.* 5. 1. 464. 9, Laconia), μεσότης<sup>3</sup> (Ditt<sup>3</sup>. 1125. 10, Attica), νεότᾶς (*IG.* 5. 1. 1427. 4, Messene), δισότης (e.g. *Insc. Priene* 61. 12; *IG.* 9. 2. 1104. 32, Magnesia), ποσότης (*IG.* 14. 956 A 11, probably also 7. 2227. 3, Boeotia), πραότης (*IG.* 12. 7. 240. 19, Minoa; possibly *ibid.* 401. 1, Aegiale), πραῦτης (*CIG.* 2788, Caria), σεμνότης (e.g. *IG.* 12. 1. 84. 6, Rhodos), χρηστότης (*IG.* 12. 7. 395. 28, Aegiale; *ibid.* 5. 2. 269. 11, Mantinea), ὡμότης (*Insc. Priene* 17. 8, 29; Ditt<sup>2</sup>. 226. 108, 350. 15).

<sup>1</sup> Also in the form οἰκειότης e.g., *Insc. Priene* 55. 27. It is by far the most frequent in inscriptions of all words in -τητ-.

<sup>2</sup> Restored by conjecture, but very doubtful because other occurrences of this word in inscriptions are metrical.

<sup>3</sup> Here the use of the word in -τητ- is due to the philosophical style of the inscription.

## WORD-LIST

## -οτης

- γραότης** CGL., Gloss. [p. 59.]  
**πραότης** Lys.+[p. 76.]  
 αύτο- Eustath. [p. 55.]  
**στραβότης** Eustath.  
**άνηβότης** Pach., Elias Cret.  
**έφηβότης** Theophil. [p. 58.]  
**ραιβότης** Eustath.  
**στιλβότης** Plut.+  
**σκαμβότης** Athanas.  
**κολοβότης** Plut.+  
**δλιγότης** Plato+  
**παραλογότης** Nicet. Chon.  
**άξιολογότης** Hippoc.  
**άργότης** Epiph.  
**μαργότης** Soph.+  
**λαμαργότης** Philo  
**έναργότης** Poll. [p. 50.]  
**γοργότης** Hermog.+  
**ένδότης** Dionys. Areop. 121 B, Max.  
 Conf. Schol. [pp. 61, 71.]  
**ποδότης** Aristot. [p. 59.]  
**άνειδεότης** Did. A. 404 B.  
**θέοτης** Plut.+[pp. 58, 76.]  
 ἀ- Plato+  
**πολυνθεο-** (?) Orig. [p. 55.]  
**συν-** Did. A. 321 B.  
**φιλο-** Poll.+  
**αύτο-** Dionys. Areop., Epiph.+  
 [pp. 58, 70.]  
**ήπερ-** Dionys. Areop. 981 A.  
**πολυ-** Just. Mart.+  
**άλεότης** Galen. Lex. Hipp. [pp. 50, 68.]  
**άργαλεότης** Philo, Eustath.  
**κερδαλεότης** Eustath.  
**ρώμαλεότης** Eustath.  
**θαρραλεότης** } Philo, Plut.+  
**θαρσαλεότης** }  
**τηφαλεότης** Ephraem. Syr.  
**άτρεμεότης** Hippoc. [p. 50.]  
**νέότης** Hom.+[pp. 44 ff., 55, 69, 76.]
- ένεότης** Cratin., Aristot.+  
**κενεότης** Hippoc. [p. 72.]  
**στρεπότης** Plato+  
**τραπεζότης** Plato [pp. 57 f.]  
**άγαθότης** LXX+[p. 70.]  
 αύτο- Dionys. Areop., Epict.+  
 αύτ- Nicet. Dav.  
**ήπερ-** Dionys. Areop. 593 C.  
**κυαθότης** Plato [p. 57.]  
**ληθότης** Hesych. + [pp. 53, 60.]  
**ἀληθότης** Philo+ [p. 50.]  
**ξανθότης** Agathar., Strab.  
**πλινθότης** Greg. Naz. (Soph.) [p. 66.]  
**όρθότης** Aristoph., Xen. + [p. 45.]  
**έφθότης** Hippoc.  
**ἴότης** Hom. +[pp. 51, 68, 76.]  
**βεβαιότης** Thuc.+  
 ἀ- Polyb.+  
**ῥαγδαίότης** Poll.  
**σπουδαιότης** Plato+  
**χνδαιότης** Did. A. 820 B+  
**βιαιότης** Antipho+[p. 68.]  
**ἀναγκαιότης** var. lect. Lys. 894. 20,  
 Polyb.+  
**δικαιότης** Xen.+  
**είκαιότης** Philod., Philo+  
 ἀν- Arr. Epict., Diog. L. [p. 55.]  
**σκαιότης** Soph., Herod.+ [p. 44.]  
**παλαιότης** Eur.+  
**δειλαιότης** Schol. Aristoph.  
**σχολαιότης** Thuc.+  
**ήρεμαιότης** Hippoc.  
**ἀτρεμαιότης** Hippoc.  
**φιλαθηναιότης** Galen.  
**γενναιότης** Eur., Thuc.+[p. 70.]  
**άραιότης** Hippoc.+  
**έδραιότης** Cornut., Clem. Al.+  
**ἀκραιότης** Polyb.+  
**λαθραιότης** Procop.  
**δικραιότης** Hippoc.

**ώραιότης** Xen. +  
 αὐθ- Greg. Cypr. [p. 55].  
**ματαιότης** LXX +  
 ἀ- Diog. L. [p. 55].  
**κραταιότης** LXX + [p. 68].  
**φαιότης** Aristot.  
**κορυφαιότης** Theod. Stud. 1164 C  
 [pp. 58, 70].  
**ἀρχαιότης** Plato + [p. 76].  
**βιότης** h. Hom. + [pp. 51, 56, 76].  
**μακρο-** Aristot., Theophr.  
**προ-** Clem. Al. + [pp. 60, 68].  
**βραχυ-** Aristot., Theophr.  
**ἄγιοτης** LXX + [p. 70].  
 αὐθ- Theod. Prod. [p. 55].  
**αύτο-** Dionys. Areop., Greg. Naz.  
**παν-** after 1452 as title of patriarch of Constantinople (Kum.).  
 [p. 70].  
**ὑπερ-** Greg. Nyss.  
**τρισ-** Athanas. 1. 217 D.  
**πλαγιότης** Demetr. Aristid. + [p. 71].  
**παγιότης** Greg. Nyss., Hesych.  
**λογιότης** Philo + [p. 70].  
 αύτο- Dionys. Areop., Maxim.  
 Conf. Schol.  
 [p. 55].  
**ὑγιότης** Sext. Emp., Macar.  
**ἰδιότης** Xen. +  
**αἰδιότης** Aristot. +  
 συν- Chron. Pasch., Nicet. Byz.  
**παιδιότης** Aquil., Epiph. [p. 58].  
**ἀειδιότης** CGL.  
**καρδιότης** Gloss. [pp. 58, 69].  
**περιγειότης** Ptolem.  
**ἐπιτηδειότης** Hippoc. +  
 ἀν- Philo +  
**θειότης** false reading Isoer. 226 D,  
 Plut. + [p. 70].  
**οἰκειότης** Herod. + [pp. 68, 76].  
 ἀν- Synes.  
 φιλ- Cyril. A. 1. 561 B.  
**λειότης** Aesch. + [p. 45].  
**μεγαλειότης** LXX + [p. 70].

**τελειότης** Def. Plat., Aristot. + [p. 71].  
 ἐν- Gloss. [p. 60].  
**αἴτο-** Iambl.  
**ὑπερ-** Epiph.  
**πλειότης** Theol. Arith. 12 [p. 49].  
**μειότης** Apollon., Vettius Valens  
 (Herwerden). [p. 49].  
**ἀρειότης** Cyrill. A. 2. 524 A [p. 49].  
**καθαρειότης** IG. 5. 1, 1432. 43,  
 Eustath. [p. 76].  
**ἀνδρειότης** Xen. +  
**ἀχρειότης** LXX +  
**ἀστειότης** Liban. +  
**δηιοτής** Hom. + [pp. 47, 63 f].  
**ἡλιοιότης** Cratin. +  
**ρόθιότης** Poll.  
**ἥλικιότης** Thom. A. (Soph.) [p. 53].  
 ἀφ- Eustath. [p. 53].  
**πατρικιότης** Prisc., Antec. +  
**νηφαλιότης** Greg. Naz., Athanas.  
**ἀγγειότης** Anast. Sin. [p. 60].  
**πελιότης** Oribas. [p. 71].  
**ἀθλιότης** Plato +  
**δολιότης** LXX + [p. 68].  
**σκολιότης** Hippoc. +  
**πολιότης** Aristot.  
**τιμιότης** Aristot. + [p. 71].  
**σεβασμότης** Eccl.  
**ἐρασμότης** Epiph.  
**κοσμότης** Aristoph. + [pp. 70, 76].  
**νεανιότης** Epiph. 2. 805 A + [p. 58].  
**σκανιότης** false form for **σπανιότης**  
 ap. Herwerden.  
**Ἀρεμανιότης** Stob.  
**σπανιότης** Isocr. +  
**ὅμογνιότης** Nicet. Chon.  
**στερεμνιότης** Eustath.  
**χρονιότης** Theophr. +  
 ὀλυγο- Procl. +  
**μακρο-** CGL., Gloss.  
**πολυ-** Oribas. +  
**γειτνιότης** G. Pach. (Kum.) [p. 53].  
**δέξιγνωνιότης** Apollod. Dam.  
**αἰωνιότης** Didym. A. 517 B, Chal.  
 829 A. [p. 70].

<b>ἀξιότης</b>	Gloss.	<b>κυριότης</b>	N.T.+[pp. 68, 70.
<b>ἀν-</b>	Damasc. 1. 1232 A, Nicet.	<b>πολυ-</b>	Theophyl. [p. 55.
	Byz. 673 B.+[p. 71.	<b>μυριότης</b>	Phocylides, LXX [p. 69.
<b>δεξιότης</b>	Herod.+[pp. 46, 68, 70.	<b>ούντιότης</b>	Schol. Pind.
<b>ἐπι-</b>	Aeschin.+	<b>ώχριότης</b>	Evagr. [p. 53.
<b>περι-</b>	Anna. Comn.	<b>λασιότης</b>	Eustath.
<b>ἀμφι-</b>	Eustath.	<b>πολλα-πλασιότης</b>	Iambl.
<b>ἀμφοτερο-</b>	Theod. Stud.	<b>τετρα-πλασιότης</b>	Nicomach. Arith.
<b>γελοιότης</b>	Athen., Cyrill.		2. 5. 5.
<b>ἀλλοιότης</b>	Hippoc., Plato	<b>πεντα-πλασιότης</b>	Nicomach. Arith.
<b>δομοιότης</b>	Plato+		2. 5. 5.
<b>ἀν-</b>	Plato+	<b>τρι-πλασιότης</b>	Nicomach. Arith.
<b>αὐτο-</b>	Dionys. Areop. 820 A, 913		2. 5. 5.
	D, Hermias [p. 55.	<b>θαυμασιότης</b>	Hippoc.+ [pp. 70, 76.
<b>ἀφ-</b>	Amphiloch.	<b>πλησιότης</b>	Apollon. Dysc.+
<b>ποιότης</b>	Plato+	<b>γνησιότης</b>	Aristot.+[p. 70.
<b>ὅποιότης</b>	Nicomach. Geras.	<b>ἔξαισιότης</b>	(?) Hesych.
<b>ἐτεροιότης</b>	Plato+	<b>δσιότης</b>	Xen.+[pp. 70, 76.
<b>ἐτεροχροιότης</b>	Pyrrho ap. Diog. L.	<b>καθ-</b>	CGL., Gloss.
<b>πάτοτης</b>	Hippoc.+	<b>ἀν-</b>	Plato+
<b>ἡπιότης</b>	Hecat. Abd. ap. Joseph.+	<b>οὐσιότης</b>	Iambl.+[pp. 57 f., 60.
<b>νηπιότης</b>	Plato+	<b>ἔξ-</b>	Dionys. Areop. [p. 58.
<b>καθαριότης</b>	Herod.+ [p. 76.	<b>ὑπὲξ-</b>	Byz.
<b>μακαριότης</b>	Plato+[p. 70.	<b>αὐτεξ-</b>	Joseph.+
<b>μυριο-</b>	Jo. Chrys. [p. 55.	<b>ὅμο-</b>	Eccl.
<b>αὐτο-</b>	Jo. Chrys. [p. 55.	<b>ὅμ-</b>	L. and S. as doubtful, without citation.
<b>ἀχαριότης</b>	Polyb. [p. 48.	<b>ὑπερ-</b>	Dionys. Areop., Gregor. Thess.
<b>ἀγριότης</b>	Xen.+	<b>ἐτερ-</b>	Jo. Chrys.
<b>ἐλευθεριότης</b>	Plato+[pp. 46, 53.	<b>ἐνθουσιότης</b>	Georg. Pachym. [p. 60.
<b>ἀν-</b>	Aristot., Schol. Aristoph.	<b>ἀκονσιότης</b>	Hesych., Apollon. Soph., Schol. Aeschyl.
	[p. 53.	<b>ἐκουσιότης</b>	Philo Carp. 93 A, Phot.+
<b>ἐπιμεριότης</b>	false reading for ἐπι- μερότης Iambl. (see Thesaurus).	<b>πλουσιότης</b>	Jo. Chrys.
<b>θηριότης</b>	Aristot., Metop. Pyth. ap.	<b>βελτιότης</b>	var. lect. Schol. Pind. O.
	Stob. [pp. 46, 57, 66.		1. 5 (codex Vratisl.) [p. 49.
<b>δραστηριότης</b>	Eustath.+	<b>ἐναντιότης</b>	Plato+
<b>δλεθριότης</b>	Phot. (Kum.).	<b>ὑπ-</b>	Epicur.+
<b>καιριότης</b>	Jo. Act. in Ideler Phys. et Med. Gr. 2. 185.	<b>ὑπιότης</b>	Theophr.+
<b>ἐγ-</b>	Schol. Eur. [p. 53.	<b>ἀρτιότης</b>	Aristot.+
<b>ἐπιμοριότης</b>	Iambl.	<b>νιότης</b>	Just. Mart.+ [p. 58.
<b>μετριότης</b>	Thuc.+	<b>ծփιότης</b>	Athanas. [p. 58.
<b>ἀλλοτριότης</b>	Plato+	<b>κρυψιότης</b>	Dionys. Areop.+

- ἡσυχιότης Lys., Plato  
 ἀνεψιότης IG. 1. 61. 15, Plato+  
     [pp. 56f., 76.  
 ὁψιότης Theophr.  
 πρωιότης Theophr.  
 μαλθακότης Hippoc., Paus. 6. 23. 5.  
 κακότης Hom.+[pp. 46, 57, 66.  
 μαλακότης Plato+  
 διηνεκότης Gloss. [p. 50.  
 ἀτρεκότης Schol. Eur. [p. 50.  
 μηκότης Galen. [pp. 53, 60, 73.  
 λογικότης Athanas. 1. 65 A, Eus-  
     tath.  
 ἥθικότης Jo. Chrys., Theoph.  
 ἀλικότης doubtful reading for ἀλυ-  
     κότης Theophr. C.P. 3. 18. 8.  
 πηλικότης Nicomach. Arith. 1. 7.3+  
 ἀφηλικότης Pap. Brit. Mus. 1. 113.  
     11 (6th cent.) [pp. 49, 75.  
 καθολικότης Euseb. [p. 58.  
 νεανικότης Epiph.+  
 γονικότης Chrysobul. (Kum.).  
 πατρικότης Gloss.  
 χωρικότης Pol. Tro. 182 (Kum.).  
 αἰσθητικότης Niceph. Blemm. 769 D.  
 διακριτικότης Procl. ad Plato Parm.  
     793 (Kum.).  
 φορτικότης Aristot.+  
 ὀλκότης Hesych.  
 γλαυκότης Aristot.+  
 λευκότης Hippoc., Plato+  
 ἀλυκότης Aristot.+ [p. 46.  
 μεγαλότης Chrysipp. ap. Plut.,  
     Chron. Pasch. [pp. 51, 73.  
 καλότης Chrysipp. ap. Plut. [p. 73.  
 χθαμαλότης Did. A. 837 A, Eus-  
     tath.+  
 δμαλότης Plato+  
     ἀν-ω- Plato, Plut.  
 ἀπαλότης Hipp., Xen.+  
 σαλότης Apophth. Patr.  
 στρεβλότης Plut.+  
 ἀγγελότης Athanas. [p. 58.  
 ἀφελότης N.T.+[p. 50.
- βεβηλότης Amphiloch.  
 ἀδηλότης Prot. ap. Diog. L.+  
 ἐπ-αλληλότης Apollon. Dysc.  
 παρ-αλληλότης Apollon. Dysc.  
 κατ-αλληλότης Apollon. Dysc., Drac.  
     ἀ- Apollon. Dysc.  
 μιμηλότης Suid. [p. 68.  
 ἐφηλότης Sext. Emp. [p. 71.  
 ὑψηλότης Sext. Emp.+  
 ἐσθλότης Chrysipp. ap. Plut.  
 ὄργυλότης Aristot.+ [pp. 67 f.  
 δειλότης Hesych.  
 κοιλότης Aristot.+ [p. 72.  
 φιλότης Hom.+[pp. 57, 69f., 76.  
 θεο- Menand. Rhet.  
 ψιλότης Hippoc.+  
 κυκλότης Pseudochrys. [p. 58.  
 ψελλότης Aristot.+  
 μαλλότης (?) restored by Toup in  
     Hesych. s.v. *νωχέλεια*  
 πολλότης Damasc. [p. 51.  
 κυλλότης Eustath.  
 ὀλότης Aristot.+ [p. 44.  
     αὐτο- Procl. [p. 55.  
 διαβολότης Athanas. [p. 58.  
 θολότης Theophr. Ceram. 981 B.  
 ἀπλότης Xen.+[pp. 46, 51.  
 διπλότης Nicet. Chon. [p. 51.  
 ὑλότης Iambl. Myst. 265. 6 [pp. 57,  
     58.  
     ἀ- Plotin.  
 τραυλότης Aristot.+  
 φαυλότης Eur.+  
 στρογγυλότης Plato+  
 ἀγκυλότης Timario  
 οὐλότης Aristot.+  
 ὑπουλότης Byz., e.g., Cyrill. A.  
 καμπυλότης Hippoc.+  
 τυφλότης Plato+  
     ὄρνιθο- Theodos. Gram. [p. 55.  
 μαχλότης E. M., Schol. Lyceophr.  
 χωλότης Plut.+  
 τεραμότης Theophr. [p. 49.  
 ἵταμότης Plato+[pp. 67 f.

- ηρεμότης** Euclid. +  
**λημότης** Schol. Aristoph. [pp. 58, 60].  
**ἀσημότης** CGL., Gloss.  
**ἐπισημότης** CGL., Gloss.  
**δλιγ-αιμότης** Aristot.  
**δμ-αιμότης** Gloss. Theophil. Institt.  
**ἄν-αιμότης** Aristot.  
**έν-αιμότης** Hippoc.  
**ἐλλογιμότης** Gloss.  
**ἀλκιμότης** M. Attal. 48 (Kum.)  
**δοκιμότης** Justin. Mart., Jo. Chrys.  
**νομιμότης** Iambl.  
**γονιμότης** Dionys. Areop. 981 A +  
**μονιμότης** Procl., Dionys. Areop., Gregor.  
**φρονιμότης** Galen. +  
**λοιμότης** LXX + [pp. 58, 67].  
**έτουμότης** Dem. +  
**πορυμότης** Eustath., Georg. Cedr.  
**ώριμότης** Schol. Hom.  
**γνωριμότης** Stob. +  
**σμάρτης** Xen. +  
**αἰδεσιμότης** Gloss., Pap. Grenfell 2. 90. 6 (Herwerden) [pp. 70, 75].  
**χρησιμότης** Euseb. +  
 ἀ- CGL., Gloss.  
**ἐντιμότης** Aristot., Schol. Aeschyl.  
**τροφιμότης** Eustath.  
**θερμότης** Hippoc. +  
 αὐτο- Basil.  
**διδυμότης** Plato +  
**ἐτυμότης** Strabo +  
**αύχμότης** a rejected reading Clem. A. 179 [p. 58].  
**ώμότης** Eur. + [p. 76].  
**ἀμωμότης** Orig. 2. 1588 C +  
**στεγανότης** Dion. P. +  
**δανοτής** Soph. [pp. 52, 63 f].  
**πιθανότης** Plato + [pp. 67 f].  
 ἀ- Aeschin. +  
**Χριστιανότης** Zonar. (Kum.) [pp. 45, 58].  
**ἰκανότης** Plato +  
 ἀν- Epiph. 1. 176 A, Amphiloch.
- μελανότης** Aristot. + [pp. 48 f].  
**μανότης** Plato +  
**ἐπανότης** Epiph. 2. 104 B [pp. 61, 71].  
**τρανότης** Philo, Plut. +  
**φανότης** Aristid., Eccl. [p. 62].  
**άγνότης** N.T. + [p. 76].  
**στεγνότης** Hippoc.  
**στυγνότης** Alexis + [p. 71].  
**ψεδόνότης** Adamant.  
**πελιδνότης** Aretae. [p. 71].  
**ένότης** Aristot. + [p. 49].  
**οὐθ-** Isid. 249 C + [pp. 49, 71].  
**κενότης** Plato +  
**ἀ-λιμενότης** Xen.  
**εὐ-λιμενότης** Menand. Rhet.  
**πολυ-λιμενότης** Menand. Rhet.  
**στε(ι)νότης** Herod. +  
**γαληνότης** Sext. Emp. + [p. 70].  
**ἀπηνότης** Epiph. 1. 957 A, Hesych. [p. 50].  
**αινότης** Herodian.  
**καινότης** Thuc. +  
**κελαινότης** Gloss.  
**φαινότης** Nil. 88 A [p. 62].  
**δεινότης** Antipho, Thuc. + [p. 76].  
**ἔλεεινότης** Schol. Eur., Eccl. [p. 68].  
**ποθεινότης** Maxim. Conf. 2. 408 C [p. 70].  
**ταπεινότης** Herod. + [pp. 66, 71].  
**σκοτεινότης** Plato, Manass.  
**λιθινότης** Fr. Herc. (Lidd. and Sc.)  
**οὐδαμινότης** Eustath.  
**κοινότης** Andoc., Xen. + [p. 72].  
**σινότης** CGL., Gloss. [pp. 60, 67].  
 ἀ- Eunap. [p. 50].  
**δακνότης** Galen., Jo. Damasc. [p. 62].  
**ρίκνότης** Greg. Nyss., Hesych.  
**πυκνότης** Hippoc., Aristoph. +  
**ἀτεραμνότης** Theophr.  
**σεμότης** Eur. + [p. 76].  
 ἀ- Epiph. 2. 32 C  
 αὐτο- M. Acom. 1.299. 22 (Kum.) [p. 55].

- κρημνότης** (?) an inferior reading  
Macc. 2. 10. 34 [p. 58.]
- γυμνότης** LXX, N.T.+
- έρυμνότης** Xen.+
- ἀρρενότης** Aristot. +[p. 49.]
- μειζονότης** Iambl. [p. 49.]
- πλειονότης** Nicomach. Geras. [p. 49.]
- μονότης** Epiph. +
- ἐλαττονότης** Iambl. [p. 49.]
- στιλπνότης** Plut., Galen. +
- τερπνότης** LXX+
- χανότης** Xen., Plato +
- άκινδυνότης** Galen.
- μεγαλυνότης** Epist. Leon. Isaur. [p. 62.]
- στρυφνότης** Aristot. +
- λιχνότης** Schol. Aristoph.
- ἰσχνότης** Hippoc. +
- τριγωνότης** Plotin.
- παρα-δοξότης** Themist.
- ἐπι-δοξότης** Aquil. +
- ἐν-δοξότης** Hesych. +[p. 70.]
- μεγαλο-δοξότης** Eustath. Opusc. 319. 82 [p. 70.]
- λοξότης** Strabo +
- φοξότης** Schol. Galen.
- νούτης** Damasc. [p. 58.]
- ἀθροότης** Apollon. ap. Oribas. 2. 65. 11, Alex. Aphr., Diog. L.
- ποτής** Hom. +[pp. 54, 62f., 72.]
- χαλεπότης** Thuc. +
- θεοπρεπότης** Nicet. Paphl. 93 D [p. 50.]
- λιπότης** Aristot. [p. 60.]
- κυπότης** Hippocr. [p. 71.]
- σκυπότης** Schol. Luc.
- χαροπότης** Plut. +
- ἴππότης** Simplic., Schol. Aristid. [p. 58.]
- γρυπότης** Xen. +
- ἀρρενωπότης** Const. Manass.
- ἀνθρωπότης** Philo qu. det. 21, Clem. A., Sext. Emp. +[pp. 58, 69, 76.]
- ἐν-** Cyril. [p. 62.]
- συν-** Anastas. Sin. [p. 58.]
- σκυθρωπότης** Hippoc. +
- στιβαρότης** Euseb. +[p. 71.]
- σοβαρότης** Ephr. Syr., Zonar.
- βαρβαρότης** Schol. Eur. +[p. 58.]
- λαγαρότης** Heliod. +
- πλαδαρότης** Hermes, Galen.
- μαδαρότης** Hippoc. +
- νδαρότης** Clem. A., Epiph., Vita Chrys.
- καθαρότης** Hippoc. +[p. 70.]
- χλιαρότης** Athanas., Procl., Nil.
- μιαρότης** Orig. +
- βριαρότης** Eustath.
- χαλαρότης** Xen. +
- ἱλαρότης** LXX (Prov. 18. 22) +
- ενύμαρότης** Callistr. [p. 50.]
- πιναρότης** Eustath.
- λαπαρότης** Hippoc.
- λιπαρότης** Hippoc. +
- ρυπαρότης** Athen., Manass. [p. 71.]
- μυσαρότης** Eccl.
- ἀβρότης** Pind. +
- λαβρότης** Muson. ap. Stob. +
- ἀγρότης** Gloss.
- ὑγρότης** Eur. +[p. 71.]
- δροτής (?)** Hom., see p. 59.
- ἀδροτής = ἀνδροτής**, q.v.
- ἀδρότης** Theophr. +
- φαιδροτης** Isochr. +
- ἀ(ν)δροτής** Hom. [pp. 45, 59, 63.]
- ἀνδρότης** Phintys ap. Stob. 3. 84 [p. 60.]
- ἀν-** Nicet. Chon. (Kum.).
- δεινδρότης** Suid. [pp. 58, 62.]
- σφοδρότης** Xen. +
- νδρότης** Procl. [p. 60.]
- ἀμυδρότης** Procl. +
- φοβερότης** Aristot., Joseph.
- στυγερότης** Gloss.
- σταθερότης** Philo Gai. 38, Eustr., Theod. Prodr.
- ἀπελευθερότης** Theophil. [p. 58.]
- ιερότης** Tzetz. [p. 70.]
- ἀρχ-** Georg. Pachym. [p. 59.]
- σφαλερότης** Byz.

- θολερότης** Hippoc.  
**ἡμερότης** Hippoc. + [p. 70.  
   άν- Gloss.]  
**ἐπιμερότης** Iambl. [p. 50.  
**φανερότης** Philo ap. Euseb.  
**χλοερότης** Aristot.  
**νοερότης** Dionys. Areop. 705 B.  
**περιπερότης** Ps. Chrys.  
**νοσερότης** CGL.  
**έτερότης** Aristot. +  
   άιτο- Plotin. [p. 55.  
**πτερότης** Aristot. [p. 57.  
**καρτερότης** Joseph., Cyrill.  
**ἐπαριστερότης** Aristot.  
**δευτερότης** Anast. Sin.  
**ζοφερότης** Niceph. Blemm.  
**τρυφερότης** Aristot. +  
**σταθηρότης** Dion. H. +  
**ἀνθηρότης** Schol. Pind., Nicet. Chon.  
**ληρότης** Schol. Ar. Nub. 783 [pp. 68,  
   69.  
**σκληρότης** Hippoc. +  
**πληρότης** Plut. + [pp. 46, 50.  
   ὑπερ- Dionys. Areop. 909 C [p. 50.  
**αὐχημηρότης** Menand. Rhet.  
**ξηρότης** Thuc. +  
   άιτο- Tit. B. 1192 B [p. 55.  
**πηρότης** Theod. Prodr.  
**αἰστηρότης** Xen., Plato + [p. 45.  
**σαθρότης** Eustath., Eccl., e.g., Jo.  
   Chrys.  
**έρυθρότης** Aristot. +  
**νωθρότης** Hippoc., Aristot.  
**έταιρότης** CGL. [p. 58.  
**πεπειρότης** Aristot.  
**προχειρότης** Cornut. 217, Arr. Epict.,  
   Sext. Emp.  
**άκρότης** Hippoc. + [pp. 45, 71.  
   έθελο- Did. A. 937 A, Epiph. [p. 55.  
**φαλακρότης** Hippoc., Aristot. +  
**μακρότης** Aristot. + [p. 45.  
**νεκρότης** Orig. 1. 904 C +  
**(σ)μικρότης** Anaxag. ap. Aristot.,  
   Plato +  
   άιτο-σ- Procl. Parm. 677 (Soph.)  
   [p. 55.
- πικρότης** Herod., Eur. +  
**βορύτης** Eustath.  
**βορβορότης** Oecumen. in Epist.  
   Cath. [p. 58.  
**δια-φορότης** Plato +  
**παρα-φορότης** Plato [p. 68.  
**γρηγορότης** Th. Lask. Cod. Par.  
   3048 (Kum.) [p. 51.  
**σαπρότης** Plato +  
**λεπρότης** Jo. Chrys.  
**λαμπρότης** Herod. + [pp. 68, 70, 76.  
   έκ- Msc. Bononiensis [p. 70.  
**ἀσπρότης** Anastas. Sin., Gloss. Zach.  
   parap.  
**λυπρότης** Strabo  
**στερρότης** Aristot. + [p. 70.  
**πυρρότης** Aristot. +  
**πατρότης** Greg. Nyss., Dionys.  
   Areop. + [p. 60.  
**έμ-μετρότης** Aristaen.  
**συμ-μετρότης** Galen.  
**οίκτρότης** Poll., Schol. Eur.  
**έκκεντρότης** Ptolem. +  
**μαγιστρότης** Euseb. 2. 769 A [p. 58.  
**γανρότης** Plut., Caesar.  
**φλαυρότης** Plut., Poll.  
**ἀμαυρότης** Euseb., Eustath.  
**κραυρότης** Theophr., Galen.  
**ἀφανρότης** Anaxag. ap. Sext. Emp.  
**λιγυρότης** Philodem. Vol. Herc.  
   (Herw.)  
**ψαθυρότης** Aristot., Galen.  
**βδελυρότης** Manass.  
**ἄλμυροτης** Hippoc. +  
**οίκουρότης** Nicet. Chon. [p. 69.  
**πυρότης** Galen., Plotin. [p. 60.  
**βλοσυρότης** Eustath.  
**γλαφυρότης** Philo, Luc. +  
**έχυρότης** var. lect. for **όχυρότης**  
   Polyb. 1. 57. 6, Philo  
**όχυρότης** Polyb. +  
**ἰσχυρότης** Dionys. H., Philo  
   άν- Gloss.  
**έλαφρότης** Plato, Poll. [p. 46.  
**στιφρότης** Timocl. ap. Athen.

- μελιχρότης** Schol. Theoer.  
**πενιχρότης** Sext. Emp., Hesych.  
**αἰσχρότης** Plato+[p. 68].  
**γλυσχρότης** Aristot.+  
**ψυχρότης** Hippoc., Plato+  
**δώροτης** Plato+  
**μετεωρότης** Cornut.  
**χλωρότης** Hippoc.+  
**μωρότης** Gloss.  
**μεσότης** Plato+[pp. 45, 72, 76].  
**ξυμ-** Iambl. Myst. 225, var. lec.  
     for preceding. [p. 55].  
**ἰσότης** Eur.+[p. 76].  
**ἀν-** Plato+  
**παρ-** Diophant.  
**αὐτο-** Dionys. Areop., Procl.  
**αύτ-** Dionys. Areop. [p. 55].  
**βλαισότης** Aristot.  
**ποσότης** Aristot.+[pp. 72, 76].  
**αὐτο-** Theod. Lask. 1338 A [p. 55].  
**δόποσότης** Nicomach. Geras.  
**όροσότης** Critias ap. Herodian.  
     [pp. 52, 68].  
**περισσότης** Isoer.+  
**ἀ-περιττότης** Clem. A., Sext.  
     Emp.  
**βαναυσότης** CGL., Gloss.  
**ἀμουσότης** Agath.  
**ῥυσότης** Plut. [p. 71].  
**σχηματότης** Hermes in Stob. Ecl.  
     [pp. 59, 67].  
**σωματότης** Galen., Plotin.+[pp. 57,  
     59].  
**ἀ-** Philo+  
**ἀκρατότης** Hippoc.  
**θνητότης** Eccl., e.g., Jo. Chrys.,  
     Schol. Luc.+  
**ρητότης** Iambl. Arith. Nicomach.  
     128 C.  
**ἀφορητότης** CGL., Gloss.  
**λιτότης** Diod.+[p. 72].  
**ἐκτότης** Galen. [p. 61].  
**ἀνεκτότης** Basil. 3. 625 D, Macar.  
**παντότης** Damasc. [p. 48].
- χαριεντότης** Chrysipp. ap. Plut.  
     [p. 48].  
**όντότης** Dionys. Areop. 817 C+  
     [p. 48].  
**λεπτότης** Aristoph., Hippoc.+  
**περιβλεπτότης** PB. 547. 3, CGL.,  
     Gloss. [pp. 70, 75].  
**τρεπτότης** Jo. Chrys. 1. 695 D,  
     Hesych.  
     ἀ- Athanas.+  
**κυρτότης** Aristot.+  
**Σεβαστότης** Cinnam., M. Acom. 2.  
     63. 10 (Kum.) [p. 58].  
**αὐθεκαστότης** Phryn. 349  
**ναστότης** Simplic. ad Aristot. Phys.  
**ἀφραστότης** Athanas. 2. 1164 B.  
**ζεστότης** Paus.  
**μεστότης** Hermog.  
**χρηστότης** Eur.+[pp. 71, 76].  
**ἀνηποιστότης** Gloss.  
**πιστότης** Herod.+  
**Χριστότης** Jo. Damasc., Did. A.  
     [p. 58].  
**ἐλαχιστότης** Byz.  
**περιπτότης** see περισσότης  
**αὐτότης** Sext. Emp., Tzetz.  
     φιλ- Vett. Val. 345. 9 (Her-  
     werden).  
**ἐαντότης** Procl. [p. 60].  
**ταῦτότης** Aristot. [p. 60].  
**πινυτότης** Eustath.  
**τοιουτότης** Anon. ap. Cram. An.  
     Par. 4. 283.  
**αὐνότης αὐνότης** Aristot.  
**σκυνφότης** Ephraem. Syr., Ant. Mon.  
**γριφότης** Herodian Epim. 16 [p. 58].  
**στεριφότης** Schol. Hom.  
**ἀδελφότης** LXX+[pp. 58, 69 f].  
**σομφότης** Aristot.  
**κυφότης** Hippoc.+  
**κουφότης** Eur.+[pp. 63, 68].  
**στυφότης** Plut.+  
**κωφότης** Hippoc., Plato+  
**σικχότης** Eustath.

<b>ἐπαρχότης</b>	Macar., Jo. Chrys. + [pp. 58, 67, 72.]	<b>μεγαλο-</b>	(Kum.)
<b>ὑπαρχότης</b>	Justin. Novell. 70 proem. [pp. 58, 67.]	<b>πτωχότης</b>	Herm. Vis. 3. 12
<b>ψυχότης</b>	Jo. Damasc. [pp. 57 f. ἀ- Niceph. Blemm. 769, 772.]	<b>γαμψότης</b>	Aristot.
<b>έμ-</b>	Niceph. Blemm. 769, 772	<b>κομψότης</b>	Isoctr. +
		<b>ξώρτης</b>	Plut. + [p. 58. ἀει- Isid. 841 A]
		<b>ἀθωότης</b>	Aquil.

**-ρτης**

**ἀκαθάρτης** (?) a doubtful reading (in the genitive) Apoc. 17. 4 [pp. 54 f.]

**-ντης**

<b>πραΐτης</b>	LXX, N.T., Eccl., CIG. 2788 [p. 76.]	<b>δριμύτης</b>	Hippoc., Plato +
<b>πρεσβύτας</b>	CIG. 2448. 4. 28, 6. 29 [pp. 48, 63, 76.]	<b>πυντάς</b>	Anth. Pal. 7. 490 [pp. 54, 63.]
<b>ἔγγύτης</b>	Dionys. Thrax + [p. 61.]	<b>μεταξύτης</b>	Nicom., Sext. Emp. + [pp. 61, 71.]
<b>λιγύτης</b>	Eustath. (Kum.)	<b>ծէնτης</b>	Hippoc., Plato +
<b>βραδύτης</b>	Hom. + [pp. 63, 73.]	<b>βαρύτης</b>	Thuc. + [pp. 45, 63, 73.]
<b>ήδύτης</b>	Schol. Aristoph. + [p. 45.]	<b>εύρύτης</b>	Hippoc. + [p. 73.]
<b>βαθύτης</b>	Luc., Himer. Or. 4. 1 [p. 73.]	<b>δασύτης</b>	Aristot. + [p. 73.]
<b>ἰθύτης</b>	Aretae.	<b>θρασύτης</b>	Hippoc., Thuc. + [p. 73.]
<b>εὐθύτης</b>	Aristot. +	<b>πλατύτης</b>	Hippoc., Xen. + [p. 73.]
<b>ἄν-</b>	Th. Stud. 937 A [p. 55.]	<b>παχύτης</b>	Herod. + [p. 73.]
<b>γλυκύτης</b>	Herod. + [pp. 45, 70.]	<b>βραχύτης</b>	Thuc. + [p. 45.]
<b>ἀκύτης</b>	Pind. + [p. 47.]	<b>τραχυτής</b>	Aeschyl. + [p. 63.]
<b>ἀμβλύτης</b>	Aristot. +	<b>ταχυτής</b>	Hom. + [pp. 63, 73, 76.]
<b>θηλύτης</b>	Aristot. +		